Summer
JUNE 1958

AAUP BULLETIN

VOLUME 44 NUMBER 2

The American Intellectual

Science and Humanities in Education

Presidential Address

In Corporibus Sanis

The Technological University of Budapest

Freshman Illiteracy and Professorial Jeopardy

Before You Say "Yes" to an Overseas Assignment

Mama, Stay Away from My Door

Annual Meeting—Actions on Censure—Resolutions

New Officers, Council, and General Secretary

Membership and Dues—Tax Developments

Dues Increase—1959

Retirement and Insurance

A PUBLICATION OF THE

American Association of University Professors

THE TASK FOR FUND RAISING COUNSEL

There is an awareness of the critical situation in the nation's education system today throughout the land.

But it is, by and large, a quite casual awareness.

Many whom Sputnik I awakened have been lulled by Explorer I, or made indifferent or inactive by economic trends.

Translating this largely latent concern into active financial support for America's colleges and universities is a prime task for fund raising counsel.

Lawson Associates, a qualified and experienced firm, for nearly two decades has specialized in planning and directing fund raising and public relations programs for colleges, hospitals and churches.

Our efforts encompass the fields of short-term and long-range fund raising programs, public relations, and leadership surveys.

An executive of this firm will be pleased to visit you in order that you might have a better understanding of our services and of the philosophy of financial programming which guides us.

Simply write or telephone, collect, the Lawson Associates office nearest you and a mutually-convenient visit will be arranged.

No cost or obligation, of course, for an explanatory discussion and a preliminary analysis of your institution's financial position.

LAWSON ASSOCIATES inc.

Fund-raising Counsel

Home Office:
53 North Park Avenue
Rockville Centre, New York
ROckville Centre 6-0177

Central Division:
3545 Lindell Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri
Jefferson 5-6022

Western Division:
101 Jones Building
Seattle, Washington
Mutual 3691

North Central Division:
24 North Wabash Avenue
Chicago 2, Illinois
Financial 6-4504

Southwest Division:
2015 J Street
Sacramento 14, California
Hickory 6-5759

AAUP BULLETIN

A publication of the

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Summer Issue

VOLUME 44 NUMBER 2 JUNE 1958

Editor	GEORGE POPE SHANNON
Associate Editors	WARREN C. MIDDLETON WILLIAM P. FIDLER
Editorial Committee	SHERIDAN BAKER DOROTHY BETHURUM ROBERT K. CARR JOHN LUSKIN U. S. MAXWELL

Publication Office: 20th and Northampton Streets, Easton, Pa. *Editorial Office:* 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Advertising Representative: Dr. Henry J. Klaunberg, National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. Issued five times a year: Spring (March and April), Summer (June), Autumn (September), and Winter (December). Subscription price (due and payable in advance) is $3.50 a year, postage free. Foreign subscriptions including Canada are $4.00 a year. Second-class mail privileges authorized at Easton, Pa. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

OFFICERS AND THE COUNCIL

President

Bentley Glass (*Biology*) — The Johns Hopkins University

First Vice-President

Warren Taylor (*English*) — Oberlin College

Second Vice-President

Glenn R. Morrow (*Philosophy*) — University of Pennsylvania

General Secretary

Robert K. Carr (*Political Science*) — Washington Office

Associate Secretary

George Pope Shannon (*English*) — Washington Office

Staff Associates

Warren C. Middleton (*Psychology*) — Washington Office
William P. Fidler (*English*) — Washington Office
Bertram H. Davis (*English*) — Washington Office

Treasurer

Richard N. Owens (*Business Administration*) — George Washington University

Counsel

Ralph F. Fuchs (*Law*) — Indiana University

Term Members

April 1956–April 1959

Dorothy Bethurum (*English*) — Connecticut College
Harvey L. Carter (*History*) — Colorado College
Elmer L. DeGowin (*Internal Medicine*) — State University of Iowa
Robert M. Kamins (*Economics*) — University of Hawaii
Robert C. Murdoch (*Mathematics*) — University of British Columbia
William A. Neiswanger (*Economics*) — University of Illinois
Anderson Nettleship (*Pathology*)
Ralph M. Sargent (*English*) — Haverford College
Charles K. Trueblood (*Psychology*) — American University
Preston Valien (*Sociology*) — Fisk University

April 1957–April 1960

Francis M. Boddy (*Economics*) — University of Minnesota
Ian Campbell (*Geology*) — California Institute of Technology
Julius Cohen (*Law*) — Rutgers University
William L. Halstead (*English*) — University of Miami
Fritz Machlup (*Economics*) — The Johns Hopkins University
Walter P. Metzger (*History*) — Columbia University
Enos G. Pray (*Biology*) — Hanover College
John A. Rademaker (*Sociology and Anthropology*) — Willamette University
Willard L. Thorp (*Economics*) — Amherst College
Walter P. Webb (*History*) — University of Texas

April 1958–April 1961

Frances C. Brown (*Chemistry*) — Duke University
Ralph S. Brown, Jr. (*Law*) — Yale University
Norman Henry Cromwell (*Chemistry*) — University of Nebraska
David Fellman (*Political Science*) — University of Wisconsin
Bernard F. Haley (*Economics*) — Stanford University
W. Stull Holt (*History*) — University of Washington
Eric W. Lawson (*Finance and Economics*) — Syracuse University
Joseph D. Novak (*Mathematics*) — University of South Carolina
Henry H. H. Remak (*German, Comparative Literature*) — Indiana University
Allan R. Richards (*Political Science*) — University of New Mexico

Former Presidents

Fred B. Millett (*English Literature*) — Wesleyan University
William E. Britton (*Law*) — University of California (Hastings College of Law)
University of Illinois, *Professor Emeritus*
Helen C. White (*English*) — University of Wisconsin

Contents

THE ASSOCIATION'S NEW OFFICERS, COUNCIL MEMBERS, AND GENERAL SECRETARY, *Robert K. Carr* 389
GRAVESIDE THOUGHTS, *Charles Philbrick* 391
THE ASSOCIATION IN 1958, *Helen C. White* 392
GOVERNMENT SECURITY CHECKS, *Haverford College Faculty Statement* 401
THE AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL, *Morton Cronin* 403
PROFESSOR BY MERIT, *Philip Appleman* 415
IN CORPORIBUS SANIS, *Milton Millhauser* 416
BEFORE YOU SAY "YES" TO AN OVERSEAS ASSIGNMENT, *Peter F. Oliva* 422
THE TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST, *Michael S. Samsonow* 428
FRESHMAN ILLITERACY AND PROFESSORIAL JEOPARDY, *Richard B. Hovey* 430
MAMA, STAY AWAY FROM MY DOOR, *Keen Rafferty* 439
LET'S BURY THE "LIBERAL," *Benjamin Brickman* 444
NOT WITHOUT CHAGRIN, *Eleanor Graham Vance* 447
CENSURED ADMINISTRATIONS 448
SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES IN EDUCATION, *Eugene Rabinowitch* 449
MEMBERSHIP, DUES, AND RELATED MATTERS, *Bertram H. Davis* .. 465
INCREASE IN DUES—1959 475
REPLY TO A WELL-KNOWN HUMORIST, *Florence P. Lewis* 475
ANIMADVERSIONS ON BLACK AND WHITE HORSES 476
BLACK HORSES MAY (OR MAY NOT) EAT MORE THAN WHITE HORSES, *Lawrence F. Mansfield* (WITH COMMENTS BY *Harold C. Hand*, AND REJOINDER) 477
CORRIGENDA, *Edwin Moise* (WITH COMMENTS BY *Harold C. Hand*) 488
TAX DEVELOPMENTS 495
SIXTY-FIVE *and* TO THE DEAN UPON BEING ASKED TO SERVE ON A COMMITTEE (*Two Poems*), *Ralph Steinhardt, Jr.* 500
FORTY-FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING 501
ACADEMIC RETIREMENT AND INSURANCE PROGRAMS 508
SCHOLAR'S CHOLER, *Jane Goddard* 515
EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS (ECONOMIC STATUS) 516
ORGANIZATIONAL NOTES 521
EDITOR'S NOTES 523
MEMBERSHIP 527
ACADEMIC VACANCIES AND TEACHERS AVAILABLE 538

Contributors

TO THIS ISSUE

PHILIP APPLEMAN is Assistant Professor of English at Indiana University.

BENJAMIN BRICKMAN is Associate Professor of Education at Brooklyn College.

ROBERT K. CARR is the General Secretary of the American Association of University Professors, on leave of absence from Dartmouth College, where he is Joel Parker Professor of Law and Political Science.

MORTON CRONIN is Assistant Professor of English at Los Angeles State College.

BERTRAM H. DAVIS is Staff Associate in the Central Office of the American Association of University Professors.

JANE (MRS. FRANK) GODDARD is a resident of Altadena, California.

HAROLD C. HAND is Professor of Education at the University of Illinois.

RICHARD B. HOVEY is Associate Professor of English at Western Maryland College.

FLORENCE P. LEWIS is retired and resides in Baltimore, after long service as Professor of Mathematics and Astronomy at Goucher College. She was for 19 years Treasurer of the American Association of University Professors.

LAWRENCE F. MANSFIELD is Assistant Professor of Economics at The Florida State University.

MILTON MILLHAUSER is Associate Professor of English at the University of Bridgeport.

EDWIN MOISE is Professor of Mathematics at the University of Michigan.

PETER F. OLIVA is Associate Professor of Education at the University of Florida.

CHARLES PHILBRICK is Assistant Professor of English at Brown University, and a "practicing poet."

EUGENE RABINOWITCH is Professor of Botany at the University of Illinois and Editor of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.*

KEEN RAFFERTY is Professor of Journalism at the University of New Mexico.

MICHAEL S. SAMSONOW is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Loyola University of Los Angeles.

RALPH STEINHARDT, JR., is Professor of Chemistry at Hollins College.

ELEANOR GRAHAM (Mrs. W. Silas) Vance resides in Edinburgh, Texas, where her husband is Professor of English at Pan American College.

HELEN C. WHITE is Professor of English at the University of Wisconsin and has recently completed her term as President of the American Association of University Professors.

The Association's New Officers, Council Members, and General Secretary

By ROBERT K. CARR
General Secretary

The Officers and Council members of the Association, whose election was announced at the close of the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting in Denver, are as follows:

President: BENTLEY GLASS, Biology, The Johns Hopkins University
First Vice-President: WARREN TAYLOR, English, Oberlin College
Second Vice-President: GLENN R. MORROW, Philosophy, University of Pennsylvania

COUNCIL, April 1958–April 1961

FRANCES C. BROWN, Chemistry, Duke University
RALPH S. BROWN, JR., Law, Yale University
NORMAN HENRY CROMWELL, Chemistry, University of Nebraska
DAVID FELLMAN, Political Science, University of Wisconsin
BERNARD F. HALEY, Economics, Stanford University
W. STULL HOLT, History, University of Washington
ERIC W. LAWSON, Finance and Economics, Syracuse University
JOSEPH D. NOVAK, Mathematics, University of South Carolina
HENRY H. H. REMAK, German, Comparative Literature, Indiana University
ALLAN R. RICHARDS, Political Science, University of New Mexico

Once more the Association is under deep obligation to those among its members who accepted nominations for office or council membership, whether they were elected or not. The Association's system of choosing its Council members requires that there be two nominees for each position, and, since our Nominating Committees have endeavored with considerable success to nominate outstanding persons, it follows that some emi-

nently qualified nominees do not win election. All members of the Association are indebted to these nominees, for they render a significant service to the profession by allowing their names to be presented. The Association's work grows in volume, complexity, and importance, and it is hoped that those who have not been elected to the Council will accept invitations to serve on committees or to take part in other Association activities.

A word of appreciation should be spoken for the services of the officers and ten Council members whose terms ended at the close of the Annual Meeting at Denver. As one who has had the privilege of serving the Association nationally in one capacity or another since 1952, I can speak with great confidence and feeling concerning the enthusiasm, devotion, and intelligence these people have brought to their work in behalf of the Association. The academic profession must count itself singularly fortunate to enjoy the services of such able and hardworking people. Where so many have made outstanding contributions to the welfare of our Association it is inappropriate to single out individuals for specific mention. But I cannot let the retirement of our President, Professor Helen C. White, of the University of Wisconsin, pass without stating for myself and for all those who have had the pleasure of working with her during the last two years our deep sense of appreciation for the loyalty and wisdom that have characterized her work in behalf of the Association, and our joy in having had the privilege of associating with such a wonderful person. Helen White graces both the Association and the academic profession by her identification with each. Fortunately, both can look forward to her further active services for many years to come. One of the wisest provisions of the Association's Constitution is the one that specifies that a retiring President shall continue to serve as a member of the Council for six additional years.

The persons just elected to office or Council membership have already been introduced to the Association's membership by means of the biographical sketches that were published with the report of the 1957 Nominating Committee, at page 544 of Volume 43 of the *AAUP Bulletin* (Autumn, 1957). A more complete statement concerning the Association's new President, Professor Bentley Glass, of The Johns Hopkins University, and its two Vice-Presidents, Professor Warren Taylor, of Oberlin College, and Professor Glenn R. Morrow, of the University of Pennsylvania, will be published in the Autumn issue of the *Bulletin*.

It is proving necessary for me to limit my leave of absence from my position on the faculty of Dartmouth College to one year, and thus I must give up the General Secretaryship on September 1, 1958. This decision in no sense reflects any doubts on my part about the future of the Association and its work or the challenging opportunities that lie ahead for its

General Secretary, but is, rather, a step taken in accordance with the agreement by which I assumed the office. I am delighted that I shall have the privilege of continuing to serve the Association for a period of time as Chairman of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

The Association is exceedingly fortunate in securing, as the new General Secretary, Mr. William P. Fidler. Mr. Fidler was for many years Professor of English at the University of Alabama, and since June 1, 1956, has been a Staff Associate in the Association's Washington Office. A fuller biographical statement concerning Mr. Fidler will be published in the Autumn issue of the *Bulletin*. I do want to say here that my own sense of regret at finding it necessary to limit my term as General Secretary to one year is in considerable degree lessened by my knowledge of Mr. Fidler and his work and my high expectation that he will make an outstanding General Secretary. I am happy to state that my predecessor as General Secretary, Professor Ralph F. Fuchs, with whom Mr. Fidler has also worked, shares my belief that the Association is exceedingly fortunate in securing Mr. Fidler's services as General Secretary. Members will be pleased to learn that Mr. Fidler's acceptance of the post is not restricted as to time.

Under the leadership of its new President and General Secretary, I am confident that the Association can in the years just ahead look forward to the most active and successful period in its history to date.

Graveside Thoughts

On a colleague found collapsed over a batch of freshman themes

Here lies, awaiting epilogue,
The precis of a pedagogue:
Couched in plainest of all terms,
And punctuated full of worms.

He cannot lecture down such stones,
Nor from them draw responsive moans;
No longer need he rage at failure,
Nor pen indignant marginalia.

His last coherence was, we trust,
Acceptable, from light to dust;
Let's join him in his higher classes,
Where every blessed student passes.

Charles Philbrick

Brown University

The Association in 1958[1]

By HELEN C. WHITE
University of Wisconsin

There are a great many things that a presidential address might do, especially the presidential address for an organization in which the presidency is held by a succession of specialists. For one thing, it might call the attention of the membership to the distinctive interest and contribution of the present incumbent's specialty. It is as hard for an English teacher, for example, to resist an opportunity to make another attempt to convert the Philistines to poetry as it is for the proverbial Californian to pass up an opportunity to pay tribute to the climate of California. And yielding to that temptation might perhaps be more easily pardoned in an English teacher because, while most people know they don't know much about nuclear physics, everybody is sure that he does know something about English. After all, like Moliere's man who was astonished to discover that he talked prose, he does write and speak it. But I think that a presidential address of the American Association of University Professors in this year of 1958 might better be occupied with a look at where the Association stands in the immediate context of this particular date.

Though basically academic, the Association is a very practical organization. It is concerned with theory—in my judgment, with some of the most important issues of theory of our time. But it is, also, very much preoccupied with the transformation of theory into practice, which, after all, is the basic objective of all education. While I doubt that the transformation of theory into practice has ever been a smooth or in any sense orderly operation, I am sure it cannot be either easy or efficient in an age of as shattering acceleration of change as we are experiencing in this present decade of man's long history. It is always tempting for anyone interested in a given organization of life in the light of principle to regard change with concern, and understandably so. It is difficult enough to bring order into any situation, without having immediately to reorganize it in the light of a new crisis. And there would seem to be some limit

[1] Presidential address given at the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors in Denver, Colorado, April 25, 1958.

to the constitutional capacity of even the most flexible of people to go on making adjustments to unending change. The problem here is not unlike that problem that the engineers have had to face in the multiplication of instruments of control for an airplane to the point where the instrument board becomes simply too complicated for the span of human attention. The acceleration of technical and social and political change in our period certainly explains, if it does not justify, the sense of confusion that disquiets even the most resolute.

It is important, therefore, to remind ourselves now and then that change can be for the better as well as for the worse. It is rather like the old question of good and bad chance. All of us are quite aware that we do, at times, have bad luck. But not all of us recognize that there are times when we do have better luck than we deserve. I think that tonight all of us, looking back even to the time of our last presidential address, will recognize that at a number of points involving our major interests there have been striking improvements in the over-all situation.

II

To take, first of all, the area of our most fundamental concern, academic freedom. Before our organization was fully three years old, it found itself in a postwar period, when the inevitable over-simplification of wartime thinking joined with the postwar weariness of any thinking at all to produce a climate of suspicion and alarm that was hostile to the basic academic undertaking. We saw the same situation repeat itself at the end of the Second World War in an even more aggravated form because that great effort was followed not, like the first, with an unsatisfactory and disillusioning peace, but with something even more disappointing, a sort of limbo between peace and war, which seemed to combine the frustrations of the one and the anxieties of the other with no prospect of constructive solution. The result was an atmosphere in which, as we all know only too well, a variety of onslaughts could be made not only upon freedom of thought, but upon thought itself. There is, I think, no question that today the situation is improved. It is improved partly because intelligent men finally came to appreciate the danger, partly because the various agitations that had been raised finally got out of the hustings and the headlines into the courts, and partly because of a new crisis that bit so sharply into public consciousness that what was happening in 1957 suddenly became much more absorbing than what might or might not have happened in 1937. As one friend of mine put it, the issue became not how our enemies had stolen the secrets we had, but how they had stolen the secrets we didn't have.

More than a couple of millenia ago, the political moralists of an-

tiquity deplored the instability of public opinion and drew from it conclusions unflattering to the political competence of mankind at large. We do not need to embrace the aristocratic cynicism of the ancient moralists. Indeed, our democratic faith makes it impossible for us to do so. But the modern publicity expert knows well enough that the ancient moralists were quite right in their concern over the brittleness of public attention and the changefulness of public interest. It is rather like a spotlight ranging not too purposefully over a wide variety of momentary phenomena. Things passed over do not necessarily vanish, as we all unhappily know. But there is no question that it is easier at certain times to get the public to look at certain things and listen to certain things than it is at others.

We have seen such a shift of public attention in our own day and in the area of greatest concern to us. Only a couple of years ago professors were fair game for laughter and for suspicion and for neglect. They no longer are. The stock of the intellectual soared with the first Russian satellite. What research could do became suddenly a matter of great public concern, and that in an area where the public was quite ready to admit that it didn't have the answers, and it must rely on the experts for the answers. If it had been the area of morals or aesthetics, for instance, in which the world-shaking advent of the first Sputnik took place, the public would have had a field day with the suggestions of the amateur at large. But this was an area in which the average man knew that he knew nothing, and that he must turn to those who did. And suddenly the difference between ignorance and knowledge was highlighted as, I think, it never had been before in our time.

This sudden realization by the American public that well-balanced, well-adjusted mediocrity in the things of the mind was simply not good enough for the world in which we found ourselves gives an opportunity to all of us here tonight. All the jokes about long-hairs and eggheads and grinds and highbrows have suddenly become not so much obsolete as irrelevant. Whatever the shortcomings of the intellectual from the traditional American point of view, the average citizen is now quite ready to admit that he could take a chance on these shortcomings if only he could have a little more of what can be had only from the man of thought. It is, therefore, time for us to speak up.

Whenever the standards of community life are long-established and accepted, it is natural for man to assume that what everyone should know may be taken for granted. I remember the deep repugnance of one of my own teachers to the suggestion that something should be said about plagiarism to university students. It seemed to him that it would be an insult to the kind of person who might be expected to be in a university to say anything about cheating. As for the student who needed to have

something said about it, this fine old academic aristocrat could not believe that it would do any good to talk to him anyway. In any world of changing situations and contexts like ours, one of the basic needs is the constant redefining of values, the never-ending explanation of what everybody should know and the re-interpretation of what everybody takes for granted.

It is, of course, the oldest and most universal problem of religion. The famous dictum attributed to Dean Swift—that the only thing wrong with Christianity is that it has never been tried—could, I am sure, be adapted with the proper substitutions to any religious endeavor. It is, too, a problem with which the student of literature is already too familiar. I once asked the president of another university how a friend of mine in the English Department was doing. "Fine. Still all wrapped up in his work on Shakespeare. Wouldn't you think," he added, with that readiness to say the first thing that came into his mind that was one of his great charms, "that everything that needed to be said about William would have been said by now?" That every age re-read its Shakespeare and even to a certain extent created a new version of Shakespeare had obviously never occurred to him. It is because of this basic character of the world of human experience that we need not only to maintain constant vigilance in a changing situation, but we need to be constantly alert to explain what is obvious to us in the changing contexts that give new meaning and fresh extensions of meaning to even what Matthew Arnold defined as the best that has been thought and said.

III

So in our own fundamental area of concern, academic freedom. We have weathered one crisis, though, we should never forget, at the expense of a good many shattered careers and, as the number of administrations still on our censured list reminds us, with a good deal of unfinished business still to reckon with. But we cannot relax our watchfulness in view of the over-all instability of the world in which we live. We can be sure that other crises will arise—indeed, are already over the horizon of the sensitive and alert. In time of social strain, some of our fellow citizens will expect the universities to protect their sponsoring societies against threat of social upheaval, and will become frightened and resentful when they discover that they do, indeed, harbor those who may well be suspected of a disposition to encourage change. We need to be ready to explain afresh to each new group of people involved the meaning and necessity of academic freedom.

We must be ready to explain again and again that academic freedom is not a matter of personal indulgence, not a self-interested union

privilege, but the basic premise of the job which we have to do—that we are asking academic freedom not to exploit impulse or escape scrutiny for efficiency, but to do the work we have to do for society. And in the same way we should never fail to give the reasons for the freedom that we claim for our students. A young man who is not encouraged to break through the cocoon of his natural ignorance and prejudice and inertia to find his own intellectual wings will never soar above routine conformity and achieve that freshness and independence of vision to which we look for the renewal of our common hope. We should take pains to make clear to the public that supports the universities exactly what a university undertakes to do.

We should recognize that here in America a university is not a self-contained and insulated universe of its own. It isn't, of course, anywhere. But it is more dangerous for the American university professor to forget the intimate involvement of a university with a democratic society than it is for the university professor in another type of social organization. The very fact that the American university, particularly the state university, which I know best, is a major institution of a society like ours makes it necessary for us to speak up and continue speaking up as to how we see our task. One of my distinguished predecessors never ceases to remind us, and, I think quite rightly, that there is no country in the world where the work of the university is so often discussed without any realization that any expert knowledge of the topic is involved. He has even said that the last person to be asked about the university is the professor. I think he's quite right, and I think, therefore, that it is peculiarly important that we should take every chance that comes our way to say how we, as professors, see the work of the university. And I think that we should do so in terms of the actual situation which, for both good and ill, we face in this country.

To take the very simplest and perhaps most basic factor in the task of our university, the production of experts. That, of course, is the aspect of our work that is most easy for our public to understand, though it is responsible for some of the features of our university system which most puzzle our friends in other parts of the world. A very complex and highly developed industrial and technical society looks to our universities to furnish it with the experts it needs not only in the traditional professions but in the fields of technical and semi-technical management and services. In other words, the kinds of selected and trained people which are in other societies prepared by other agencies here must be trained by the university. I remember the concern of a German professor in 1946 about American suggestions for broadening the base of the German university population. He asked what all the students would do in an economy which lacked the resources of ours.

And I remember how difficult it was to make him understand that in our democratic undertaking we were trying to bring within the range of the bulk of our population what in a less democratic kind of society was reserved for the privileged few. I could see that the magnitude of that undertaking appalled him, and I had to admit that some of the things we were trying to do might very properly be considered the province of other institutions in society besides the university, if only it were not less easy, as we know, to mobilize and furnish the means to those agencies to do them. Indeed, the very nature of our democratic undertaking has put a burden on our universities which is beginning to daunt even some of our own people.

And yet it remains true that the practical application of knowledge to the social and industrial problems of everyday life is the foundation and the glory of our civilization. I once explained to a Near Eastern visitor who had been very much impressed with the prosperity and social vitality of a small Wisconsin town that the secret of its success was to be found in the large number of its citizens who had been to the university and gone back home to put what they had learned into practice. And I asked why he at the university in the capital of his country could not do what we had done and get his young university graduates back into their villages. He was aghast at the suggestion. "But what," he asked, "would a man do if he did leave the capital and go back to the mud village from which he came?" It is because our universities have sent their students back home to do the work that needed to be done that we do have the American standard of living even in rural villages, and still more important, in spite of all its shortcomings, the American standard of popular culture.

IV

But we must have something at the university for our students to carry out into practical life, a proposition to the truth of which the American public was very rudely awakened last fall. The whole house of cards collapses if we forget the traditional function of the university, which is the extension of knowledge, and the extension of knowledge not merely for practical purposes. Our whole way of thinking has been so much stamped with the Baconian approach to knowledge for the comfort of man's estate that we have too often lost sight of the vital importance of the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, of the pursuit of understanding for the sake of wisdom. We have considered practicality the distinctively American contribution to the intellectual quest. We have too often forgotten that the men who founded our first universities were not seeking to train leaders to create a heaven on earth

in a material sense, but to create on earth that kind of community which a believing man could see as a foreshadowing and a promise of something beyond the day's narrow needs. The history of university education in this country is one of constant and many-sided adaptation. The result has often proved lopsided as we tried to meet a particular need or crisis, but the cumulative effect of a series of adaptations and improvisations has been the achievement of a perhaps bewildering versatility. Most of you in this room will remember the emphasis on economics in the era of the depression, the emphasis on science in the war, the emphasis on the use of leisure in the postwar period, particularly on the use of the arts for leisure.

It is possible to see each of these responsive emphases as underscoring another color in the spectrum of human endeavor, but it is important to remember that older than any of these specific emphases is the basic human search for wisdom and grace. It is very easy in each successive crisis to look for one answer and for one answer only. There is no question that there are certain things that we need to do better for the assurance of our physical security and for the defense of our own values in the battle of ideology, which many people think more basic even than the battle of technology. But the most thoughtful men, here and abroad, recognize, I think, that if the Cold War should end tomorrow, there would still be a crisis in our civilization. It is uncomfortably true that we have underestimated the importance of scientific achievement, or perhaps not so much the importance of scientific achievement as the importance of the training indispensable to that achievement. But I think it may well be that our failure is due not so much to a failure in science as in social studies and the humanities. We have clearly underestimated our rivals, a mistake possible only to people who have been complacent about their own achievements and negligent of the achievements of other people. There is always a tendency for the braggart who has suddenly been revealed to himself to turn his histrionic talents into playing the Jeremiah. And in many quarters one may notice already a sweeping indictment of what we have been doing that might well be as destructive as our complacency. But I think there is no question that we have not taken the life of the mind as seriously as we should, and we have taken that respect for intellectual work, which is one of the things that have made us what we are, too much for granted. It is even possible that the moralists, ancient and modern, are right about the dangers of prosperity and the distractions of the delights of this world. It may well be that too many of us have settled in to enjoy what are, after all, the very real opportunities of a very engaging civilization. It may well be that we do need to toughen our intellectual fibre. But I think that

there is no doubt whatever that we need to sort out our values, to ask ourselves what we most care about doing, individually and collectively.

This is particularly true of the economic aspects of the educational crisis which are receiving so much attention at present. I am one of those who believe that the time is long past when professors should speak out quite frankly about this problem, and I welcome the steps which our association is taking in this direction. As the discussion of the educational crisis has gone on from month to month and conference to conference, one of the things that has worried me has been the academic level of the discussion by men whom one would normally expect to take a more practical view of things. Like everyone else, I have noted that the good old American "Let's do something about it" spirit has been quite apparent in the cry that more money must go into the national defense, but I can discern very little disposition on the part of political or business or other community leaders to face the full magnitude of the crisis in educational finances, or to propose anything like the drastic measures that would, alone, meet it.

The economic problem is not confined to salary levels. There is also the matter of teaching load, or extracurricular burden. Like most teachers, I am not reassured by some of the discussions of mechanical solutions to our problem. I am quite aware that there are some things that TV and radio and movies can do better than they are done today, that there are resources here that should be explored and exploited. But the discussions of the Master Teacher leave me cold. The transformation of the university profession into a few star performers, supported by an academic proletariat, seems to me a very poor prospect for bringing into the universities the men we want. There is, it seems to me, no substitute for the teacher available to the student, no substitute for the interchange between student and teacher that is the life of teaching.

In other words, just as I welcome the public concern about science, so I welcome the public interest in the economic aspects of education. But in all of these discussions, I am very anxious that the voice of the teacher and the scholar be heard. The American university has profited greatly in the past and can, I think, in the future profit even more from the contribution of business competence and experience to the consideration of university problems, and the university can make much greater use than it has to date of the specialized instruments of our technology—from recording machines to TV. But the men who are actually doing the teaching and research ought, in my judgment, to have the determining voice in the definition of the aims of the university, in the setting of its standards, and in the selection of the methods to be used to achieve those aims according to those standards. In other words, I think we should face the economic aspects of our professional life more candidly

and more systematically and effectively than we have in the past. But in what even the least historically-minded of us realizes is a new era, we may find that the definition of the goals of the university, the setting of its standards, and the flexible and humane development of its methods may well be, in the not too distant future, the most crucial area of all our preoccupations, and the establishment of the proper leadership of the university professor in his basic professional concerns may well be the most serious problem of the university world.

V

For the business of the university is not primarily the solving of the issues of 1958, vital as they are to all of us. It is rather the pursuit of those basic inquiries into the nature of the world in which we live, and into our own natures, and into the meaning and possibilities of human life, that will alone yield us the courage and understanding that we need to confront our problems intelligently. To limit those inquiries to the present emergency would be to throw away the capital of the past and foreclose the future. (If you take a look at any genuine Dark Age, you will discover that there was no lack of preoccupation with the present.) In a present so rich as ours in intoxicating possibilities, it is easy to forget that the business of the university is, as a great leader in business and applied science told us the other night in Madison, the future. And the great gift of the university to the future is not the discoveries we make, the books we write, but the men whom we enlighten and train and inspire to carry forward the basic work of the university into a world which we may be quite sure will be very different from 1958. They must be trained, and well-trained, in their specialties, but they must be broad and enlightened human beings, ready to look beyond their own professional preoccupations and give to the common business of their community, of their time, the kind of attention for which they more than most men are equipped.

This is something which we all know from our experience as students and teachers in the university, something which we have more reason to appreciate than most of our fellow men who have not enjoyed our privilege. It is, therefore, our business to see that this vision of the university is held high above all the alarums and excursions of the current popular discussion of education. Indeed, I cannot think of anything more important for the American Association of University Professors to concern itself with in this year of 1958, or, I suspect, any year.

Government Security Checks

Statement of the Haverford College Faculty[1]

Chief Justice Holmes once stated that we must retain in this country the "free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market."[2] Our primary concern about the security program of the Federal Government is that students and faculty members should not avoid controversial topics or unpopular positions for fear that these may be held against them in the future.

The basic assumption of the security program is that the Government has a right to, and indeed must, protect itself from disloyalty and subversion. Ascertaining the loyalty of any individual or the possibility of future acts of subversion by him, however, is fraught with danger. Under present security regulations it inevitably involves considerations of beliefs or opinions of both the person being investigated and the person being asked for information.[3] We must consider carefully what information should make us question a man's loyalty or think of him as a possible security risk, and what information we should pass on to security investigators.

Let us first look at two general considerations, apart from any special features which may exist because of the nature of an academic community. First, the spoken or written word or the reading or studying of certain materials is far removed from actions. To act requires more than intellectual assent. Often we may not know what we believe until we are challenged to act upon our beliefs. Second, few people reveal to others their deepest thoughts and feelings; and even when they do, opinions which are voiced are easily misinterpreted.

In addition to these two general considerations, there are certain special features of a college education which must be taken into account in arriving at judgments of loyalty or riskiness of members of the college community. One of the aims of education at college is to question and

[1] Concern felt by the Faculty of Haverford College over requests by government agents for information about students or former students of the College led to a study of the matter by a special committee. The Faculty accepted this committee's report on May 19, 1955 as a series of advices to be included in its booklet entitled *Information for Members of the Faculty*. The present publication is from pages 13–15 of this booklet, and is presented to *Bulletin* readers with the permission of the President and Faculty of Haverford College.—Note by Editor.

[2] The dissenting opinion in Abrams *et. al* v. United States, 250 U. S. 616 (1919).

[3] Some information specifically required in a full field check under the existing security program relates to beliefs and opinions—for example, "Membership in, or affiliation *or sympathetic association with*, any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, (etc.) which is totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive . . ." (underlining ours). In addition, the regulations state that information collected should not necessarily be limited to that which is specifically required; in practice it may be directly related to opinions or beliefs.

shake opinions and beliefs previously arrived at largely from knowledge and experience of others and to form opinions which have been tested by the individual himself. The student is exposed to new ideas put forth by faculty members, by other students, or in reading, and has four years in which to find himself before taking a responsible position in society. During four years he is asked to look with an open mind at different theories and philosophies. He is also encouraged to try out ideas in experience. Many students go through a series of divergent yet passionately held philosophical convictions while at college. They may defend each strongly, this being one way of testing it. The espousal by some students in discussion or papers of ideas considered subversive outside the campus must, therefore, be recognized as normal activity in a college.

Indeed, it is the person who has been completely uninterested in controversial problems when in college who may turn in times of crisis to movements advocating treasonable acts, for lack of training in analyzing the claims and social interpretations of such movements. Experience shows that those who tried to understand controversial issues are usually less likely to be taken in by panaceas. An active interest in such issues may be more a sign of loyalty than ground for questioning a man's loyalty.

It follows from what has been said that there must exist a special relationship of trust among students and faculty in their professional association. Members of the college community should feel confident that expression of their ideas will be regarded as a strictly professional matter. We believe that this relationship of trust is indispensable to a college community if it is to serve its proper function in society.

We believe further that if there is doubt expressed about the loyalty of one member of the college community by another, or about his safety as a security risk because of his thoughts, opinions, or beliefs, as distinct from his character or stability of personality, a full statement of the charge should be given in writing to the investigating authorities, a copy of which should go to the person being charged with disloyalty or potential subversion.

The American Intellectual

By MORTON CRONIN
Los Angeles State College

One of Emerson's complaints when he wrote "The American Scholar" was that his country had not yet developed a sizeable body of intellectuals. That complaint is seldom heard any more. Nowadays the grievance which spokesmen for this group express most often is not that America lacks intellectuals, but that she does not love them, that in fact she rejects them and refuses to listen to their counsel on any important subject.

Whether America has actually jilted its intellectuals or not, it is undoubtedly true that many of them believe that she has. They often describe their characteristic symptom as a feeling of *alienation*. That word is so romantic, not to say exotic, and vibrates, cello-like, with such beautifully tragic overtones that it is almost enough in itself to win an argument. But when a feeling of repudiation flourishes in a nonintellectual, it generally receives a chillingly clinical designation: *persecution complex*. Which is the fairer term depends, of course, on the facts of the matter. Is it true that the American intellectual is rejected and considered of no account in his society? I am going to suggest that it is not true. Father Bruckberger told part of the story when he made the simple observation that it is the intellectuals who have rejected America (*Harper's*, February, 1956). But they have done more than that. They have grown dissatisfied with the role of the intellectual. It is they, not America, who have become anti-intellectual.

What is an Intellectual?

The object of our scrutiny pleads for definition. What is an intellectual? I shall define him as *properly* an individual who has elected as his primary duty and pleasure in life the activity of thinking in a Socratic way about moral problems, whether these be social or individual. He explores such problems consciously, articulately, and candidly, first by asking factual questions, then by asking moral questions, finally by suggesting action which seems appropriate in the light of the factual and moral information which he has elicited. His function is analogous to

that of a judge, who must first ascertain the facts, then the law, and in the end must accept the obligation of revealing in as obvious a manner as possible the course of reasoning which led him to his decision.

This definition excludes many individuals who are usually referred to as intellectuals—the average scientist, for one. I have excluded him because, while his accomplishments may contribute to the solution of moral problems, he has not been charged, either by society or by himself, with the task of accosting any but the factual aspects of those problems. Like other human beings, he encounters moral issues even in the everyday performance of his routine duties—he is not supposed to cook his experiments, manufacture evidence, or doctor his reports. But his primary task is not to think about the moral code which governs his activity, any more than a businessman is expected to dedicate his best energies to an exploration of business ethics. During most of his waking life he will take his code for granted, as the businessman takes his ethics.

The definition also excludes the majority of teachers, even on the college level, despite the fact that teaching has traditionally been the method whereby many intellectuals earn their living. The intellectual bent of most teachers is only slightly above the average for the population as a whole. They may teach very well, and more than earn their salaries, but most of them bring little or no independent reflection to bear on human problems which involve moral judgment. This description even fits the majority of eminent, and justly eminent, scholars. Being learned in some branch of human knowledge is one thing; living in "public and illustrious thoughts," as Emerson would say, is something else.

The definition also excludes creative writers and artists, as such. They make an indispensable contribution to moral life, but it is not a Socratic contribution. They must dramatize and embellish their argument, and this necessity introduces many supra-realistic and extra-logical elements. In fact, an artist is well within his rights if he departs this world more or less completely—in music and modern painting this is the rule rather than the exception—and creates something in the realm of pure art which does not answer at all to the moral or sociological world in the ordinary sense.

The role of the intellectual must also be distinguished from that of the politician. The latter shares with the intellectual a preoccupation with moral problems, but he is not free to range where he wishes in his inspection of man's estate and to consider human problems on whatever level of abstractness or concreteness he desires. Furthermore, his duties prevent him from developing that candor which is indispensable in the intellectual. One of his principal obligations is to compose differences, and this obligation will often generate prudential reasons for not stating the whole truth as he sees it. He may think very well, and after the

Socratic manner, but if he consistently reveals the full nature of his thinking he will become a bad politician, and eventually no politician at all.

Finally, the definition separates the intellectual from the saint, the prophet, and the revolutionary. These last make the mightiest of all contributions to moral life. If any individual human beings can be said to create or discover moral values for an entire people, they are the ones who do it. But, once again, the character of their main activity cannot be called Socratic. Their typical utterances are short, sententious, and authoritative. What makes men saints, prophets, or revolutionaries is not so much their plans for mankind as it is their determination to inaugurate those plans. Convinced that they have found the truth, they concentrate—rightly, for them—on living it and making it prevail, in the course of which they do not seek the dialectical opposition which the Socratic thinker requires. Their characteristic tendency is to fight their battle with slogans and vivid affirmations which briskly summarize their thought and experience.

Precisely where, then, can one lay hold of intellectuals? Well, they can be detected in any occupation, athough in some occupations you will have to conduct a long day's hunt in order to bag one. Some teachers are intellectuals. Also some journalists. Even some editors. Some clergymen. Most theologians, I suspect, although I never met one. Some lawyers, usually young ones with time on their hands or old ones on the federal bench. Very few doctors nowadays, for obvious reasons. Some college presidents, theoretically, but I cannot remember any in my time, except Hutchins and one other whose name would not mean anything to you. An occasional businessman, so help me. Some women, no doubt. Even longshoremen contribute their portion to this category, as Eric Hoffer proves.

But in no case will a man's trade or profession necessarily mark him as an intellectual. That status is only achieved by the cultivation of three characteristics, none of which has anything in particular to do with the classifications used in employment offices.

First of all, an intellectual is interested in moral problems as they concern the generality of people, not just as they concern himself, his relatives, and his close associates. The problems with which he himself is afflicted will influence the direction of his thinking, but his thinking does not stop with whatever *modus vivendi* he works out between the world and himself. Briefly, he considers general problems, seeks general solutions, and contributes to the public philosophy.

Secondly, his views are fully articulated. He is a conscious thinker. He collects evidence, weighs and sifts it, and exhibits a developed capacity for separating the true from the false. He does not mind dis-

closing his premises and explaining his terms. He does not disdain exceptions and qualifications, nor shrink from ironies and paradoxes. His mode of discourse, in short, is at the opposite extreme from the gnomic utterance of the intuitive thinker.

His third and most important characteristic is his willingness— indeed, his eagerness—to subject his views to critical discussion. If he is a good example of his type he will glow with health and good humor in an argument. He stalks truth in the dialectic maze the way some men maneuver for love in the labyrinth of romance. Yet his object is not to score debating points. For him the pursuit of truth must be cooperative, as well as dialectic, and all the pleasure vanishes when that pursuit turns into a mere contest of wills with his interlocutor. It is easy for him to say "I don't know," and he is impressed when his own questions evoke that reply.

From what I have said concerning the occupational habitat of intellectuals, it naturally follows that, despite their absorption in what is more or less public business, they do not always occupy a public stage. Indeed, as I conceive the species, most of them do not. When the circumstances of their lives invite publication, some portion of their reflections will usually appear in print. And a few, like Walter Lippmann, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Sidney Hook, will become really public figures. But the type is not determined by the size of its audience. An intellectual's audience may consist of only a small circle of friends—no congregation, no band of students even—and he will still perform the intellectual's function as truly and authentically as his famous brothers.

What Good is an Intellectual?

The term *intellectual* is one of those words which are both honorific and pejorative. Among those who deserve it, there are men who shrink from it, men who feel ennobled by it, and men in whom both of these reactions are in sweet conflict. This is about as it should be, for there will always be bad as well as good intellectuals. But that is not the worst of it. Even in the hands of the best of intellectuals, the Socratic method of arriving at moral judgments may, like any other method known on this planet, guide men to hell as well as to heaven. An intellectual may study the available facts with matchless care, press home the most intelligent questions, develop his argument from start to finish with irreproachable logic, square his recommendation of policy with the best moral values which either his culture or his inspiration can provide— and still, when all is said and done, he is only guessing. The ultimate result is determined by Mr. X. (I do not want to offend the American intellectual by using any three-letter word.) Some things are so well known

that they are hard to remember—the fact, for instance, that what justifies the intellectual process of reaching moral decisions is not that it is unerring but only that it presumably increases the percentage of lucky bets.

The uneasiness which afflicts the position which intellectuals occupy in society also results from the fact that no preparation of any formal character, no ritual of initiation, no conjunction of the planets at time of birth must necessarily precede the practice of their vocation. Like politics or teaching English, anyone can try his hand at it, and proof of his incapacity will never be as conclusive as if he tried to splash about in theoretical physics. He can always scream that having studied with Whitehead and knowing where to put the commas are not what make the philosopher. And he will be right. The occasional forays of irregulars into intellectual analysis will commonly strike more telling blows than campaigns prepared by gouty professionals.

But the status of the intellectual wavers for still another reason. The Socratic technique, even when judged by its own standards, cannot be brought to the purity and finish that, say, chiropractic technique can be brought to. There are no pure intellectuals, and there will always be some in whom their function has been so pitifully corrupted by immoderate zeal or unconscious commitments that the best they can offer is excellent logic marching superbly towards the wrong conclusion, with only one more day of history necessary for all the world to see its falseness. And there is no remedy for these aberrations. The sensitivity to moral and human values which keeps the intellectual process from being an empty exercise in formal logic is also the thing which makes the intellectual susceptible to those loyalties which compel him to suppress facts, ignore considerations, and substitute harrumphing indignation for thoughtful candor.

Finally, any assessment of the value of an intellectual must reckon with the circumstance that his apparatus for distilling moral truth and manufacturing social policy does not enjoy a monopoly. Other contrivances compete with his for this business, some of which are called intuition, spontaneous insight, susceptibility to revelation, and unconscious reasoning. These devices represent the free play of intelligence, and owe their share of success to the fact that human affairs will sometimes yield in a flash their true nature to the moral entrepreneur whose formal equipment does not rear up between him and reality. Another operation in this market consists in invoking precedent and tradition whenever possible, thus offering both the intuitive and the intellectual products which have been turned out in the past. This mode of supplying the demand for moral ideas pleases more customers than all the others combined. And then there is the artist's practice, which appeals to those who like precision work. It often unites in varying and unpre-

dictable proportions all the other processes, including the intellectual's, but receives its most distinctive character from its concern for esthetic or stylistic values. And this concern, rarely separable in representational art and literature from a concern for moral truth, is perhaps what gives the artist that right combination of engagement and perspective which the intellectual also needs but too often lacks.

Our protagonist, in short, is never infallible, he is never perfectly intellectual, and his system is only one of several for arriving at acceptable decisions. I have dwelt on the limitations of the intellectual mode because its typical American proponent careens towards the assumption that brains and good intentions can accomplish anything. With no embarrassment whatever, he will declare his *faith* in human reason. *Faith* is the right word, but it is odd that he should use it when we remember his deprecation of it in other contexts.

On the other hand, we cannot dispense with any method which experience has demonstrated will increase our chances of success in reaching for moral truth. The intellectual possesses such a method. Popes must have theologians, as well as models of piety and stout bishops. Kings need privy councilors, wise in policy and deft in expressing it, along with patriot-heroes and capable ministers. And a healthy society requires independent intellectuals, men who work for neither Pope nor King, as well as solid citizens and good providers.

Every organized segment of church, state, and private life stands to benefit whenever the nonintellectual's resort to custom, intuition, or esthetic inspiration is checked and supplemented by the Socratic explorations which are the intellectual's particular business. But the intellectual activity which concerns us most in this discussion is that which private individuals carry on for the benefit of the public philosophy. Other things being equal, they are the intellectuals *par excellence*, for they can achieve a maximum of independence and candor. The interests of the state, of the church, and of private groups of all sorts, as interpreted by their official servants, including the intellectuals among them, have an ineradicable tendency to separate from the interests of the generality. It is the free intellectuals who constitute *society's* Kitchen Cabinet or Brain Trust, and help these servants keep their attention focused on the big picture.

Finally, the value of an article is determined, as economists say, by its scarcity as well as its utility. A good intellectual is hard to find, and even a not-so-good one is, like a so-so husband, not always obtainable when you want one. We know how to contrive as many corporation lawyers and baby specialists as we need, but formulas for making intellectuals are only rumors.

How Should an Intellectual Behave in Society?

Now that we have said what an intellectual is and have suggested both the limitations and the usefulness of his *modus operandi,* we can consider the question of his proper relations with the rest of society. And in doing this we shall come more often to what is wrong with American intellectuals.

Like other individuals who perform special functions, the intellectual requires some special privileges. As everyone knows, the most important of these is the right, not only to subject established views to a more poignant examination than is customary among most of his fellow citizens, but to state the results of his examination in a public manner without provoking the social and economic pressures with which society usually protects its established code.

Contrary to what one often hears, freedom for intellectuals—among professors it is called academic freedom—is special. It is as special as the scientist's right to practice vivisection or the judge's right to render a binding judgment. Where it differs from these rights is in the fact that everyone shares in it to some extent, and no one's share, including the intellectual's, is easy to measure. *But the intellectual's share is always larger than that of the average citizen.*

Many American intellectuals delight in suggesting that *everyone* should be free to express whatever opinions he wishes without any contraction of his social or economic opportunities. When this suggestion is not the cool product of intellectual demagoguery, it is simply the result of a naive conception of how societies are necessarily organized.

It should not be necessary to repeat that no freedom, intellectual or otherwise, is ever absolute for anyone. Furthermore, the activity of most people inevitably commits them to programs of cooperative endeavor whose ideological basis can be *widely* reconsidered only at infrequent intervals. Societies are not founded on questions; they are founded on answers, however spurious, and can accommodate only a limited number of individuals whose regular business is to challenge those answers. There are people who concede that cohesion is an indispensable attribute of a viable society but would deny society the mechanisms by which it achieves cohesion—a fatuity akin to the one which dominates those men who urge their government to negotiate international agreements but to forego as an indelicacy any effective means of enforcement.

Now, it may be that a given population as a whole should be freer than it is to express opinions. But no matter how free it becomes in this respect, its intellectuals—if it has any—must be freer. This may be undemocratic, as the scientist's special right or the judge's may be,

but without these special rights we can have no scientists, judges, or intellectuals.

I must now recite the killjoy lesson that exceptional privileges usually entail exceptional obligations. The intellectual's most important obligation consists in maintaining a greater degree of independence, integrity, and candor in his relations with the world than can be reasonably expected of most men. His primary duty is to tell the whole truth as he sees it, in detail as well as in general. His primary duty is not to make that truth prevail. In fact, if he slips too deeply into the tactical maneuvers of social action, especially those which require close organizational ties, he will, like a judge who wades in politics, evoke the suspicion that he can no longer be trusted with his special prerogative. And this suspicion will be justified by the common experience of mankind. For when an individual becomes profoundly involved in a program of political action, he usually cannot be counted on to make a fair assessment of opposing programs. Such involvement on the part of an intellectual will be enough to establish the presumption that he has stopped being an intellectual and can now with propriety be treated as factionalists treat one another.

No one can say for certain just when the line is crossed which separates the domain of the intellectual from that of the party man. There can be no Hatch Act for intellectuals. Furthermore, the location of the line will vary with historical circumstances and with the temperament of the individual concerned. But it is important for practical as well as theoretical purposes to acknowledge that the line always exists and that reasonable men can at least identify those instances in which it has been grievously overstepped.

It has been a long time since an apartment in the ivory tower was a fashionable residence for an American intellectual. In so far as this desertion of the old neighborhood has reduced a preoccupation with trivialities, as exemplified in much of the study formerly lavished on classical languages, its results have been admirable. But to the extent that it has obliterated the necessary distinction between intellectuals and their fellow citizens, its results have not been admirable. This distinction cannot be erased, even in the name of democracy, without the emaciation of intellectuals, and eventually of democracy too. The unromantic fact is that an intellectual should, when he purports to function as an intellectual, occupy a position which is somewhat remote from the urgencies and envelopments of political life. On the other hand, his reflections will not be worth much if he has had no experience of such intimacies. And his aim in life is not to achieve the impartiality of the wife in Lincoln's story who exclaimed, "Go it husband, go it bear." But when an intellectual practices his vocation he must draw back from his

experience and maximize the tranquility with which he brings that experience to the study of human problems. He must even listen seriously to whatever the bear has to say for himself. It may be that this necessity is one of the sources of error in the Socratic method. When enough people in a society have acquired a fierce taste for hot loyalty and pungent discipline, the intellectual whose mouth does not water for these sensations may lose touch with social reality. If he does lose touch, events will sweep past him and he will be left spinning like a top. But so be it. It is his occupational hazard. Even under favorable conditions his method will not always work.

No one can define with exactness that blend of thought and feeling, of detachment and engagement, which yields the best intellectual results. But the presence of too much feeling is easy to detect, and it is characteristic of the person who passes for an intellectual in America. The test is a simple one: How does he respond to opposition? How eager is he to venture his opinions in free and dispassionate debate? More often than not, he is an individual who, like any orthodox citizen, confines his ideological activity to singing hymns of faith with like-minded individuals. He accuses America of being anti-intellectual, but his own consciously-held conception of his proper role has extinguished an essential difference between the intellectual and his countrymen—for he is proud of his emotion, cultivates it on principle, and protects it from any Socratic challenge. His image of the complete intellectual is a person who (1) sympathizes intensely on the right side of current social and political questions—the right side usually being the liberal or leftist side; (2) associates more or less exclusively, even in his professional life if he can manage it, with other correct-thinking persons; (3) supplements this activity with an interest in literature, art, and folk music.

This image obviously owes something to the Marxist revolutionary, whose example, however discredited, still influences the American intellectual, if only because, like a woman between marriages, he has not yet reorganized his imaginative life around a figure of superior power. But, disturbed rather than inspired by memories of his first love, he does not participate in any revolutionary activity, which would detonate his pent-up sympathies and sweeten his disposition. Nor, if he is typical, does he express his urgencies in conventional American politics, for, despite his characteristic concern for the masses, he is curiously snobbish. He does not like the masses, he just wants to be their champion. But how? He might write on social questions, of course, but the average American intellectual—I refer now to the one whose circumstances in life would make such activity natural—the one in the academic world, for instance—is singularly unproductive in this respect. The example of Thorstein Veblen does not stir him. He does not have the patience. It

is hard to write if emotion has crystallized your thoughts into a series of slogans. You discover that they can all be put in one paragraph. You discover something worse. That paragraph has already been written. The result is that the American intellectual from whom one would normally expect a public contribution characteristically stands between thought and action and howls like a donkey in tension between two bales of hay.

The second rule of behavior for the intellectual, comparable in importance to the one which limits his partisan involvement in affairs, is that he cannot demand that society love him without reservation. A certain hostility is part of the tribute paid to distinction. Intellectuals are not alone in provoking it. Businessmen, lawyers, doctors, public officials, army officers, clergymen, even people who are just good-looking or quick-witted—all who impinge with any force upon their fellow men receive a measure of resentment. The distrust which intellectuals generate is not only natural but, provided always that it does not turn morbid, it is also desirable. It is a necessary defense of the population against an elite group which, being human as well as elite, is subject to error, presumption, and impatience, and is no more to be followed blindly than are priests or politicians. The country protects itself against Wall Street bankers in the same way; so much so, in fact, that a public statement in actual praise of them is almost unheard of. This natural hostility towards the intellectual, together with his own need to maintain an intellectual's distance, means that he need never give up all claim to that lovely word *alienation*.

But the typical American intellectual asserts that the feeling which exists between him and his society is neither normal nor desirable. He claims that America is not both pro- and anti-intellectual, but that it is just anti-intellectual. It is hard to reply specifically to this charge, because it is usually stated as an axiom. What are the facts? If I may be a witness, I must testify that on those occasions when I have been taken for an intellectual, for no other reason than that I taught in a college, I have often received such touching deference and respect that I have had to go out of my way in order to put at ease those men in other walks of life. Whoever observes alumni attending their class reunions will notice a wistful hope in some of the meatiest faces that their old professors, baggy clothes and all, will pay some attention to them.

It is true that many intellectuals, especially in the teaching profession, do not make as much money as individuals of comparable ability in other occupations. But neither do army officers and clergymen, even when they become generals and bishops. Is America abnormally anti-military and anti-religious? Indeed, intellectuals often sigh that America is too fond of the military and too soft towards religion. The arguments

for putting more money in the pockets of intellectuals are just, but America's resistance to those arguments does not prove that she is peculiarly anti-intellectual. It has been a rare period in the history of any country when being an intellectual was a paying proposition. Wealth is accumulated by people who address themselves to that objective in life. When intellectuals do this—many who enter the communication industries, for instance—they stand a better chance of collecting a fortune than many a businessman. But traditionally most intellectuals, like scientists, professional soldiers, and ecclesiastics, array themselves for other battles. They give up money, but in return they receive an opportunity to modify in a conscious way, wearing the while no man's livery, the ideology of their society, in so far as it is given to human beings to achieve such free and conscious modifications. If they prize this opportunity, the rest of the world will admire, respect, and envy them, including their shiny pants and twisted neckties. The intellectual who feels too bitter about his difficulties in acquiring a house with three bedrooms, two baths, and a knotty-pine den has succumbed to the values of those segments of his society whose influence he most deplores. If the American intellectual, despite these considerations, persists in his feeling of persecution, we may eventually witness his miserable demise *à la Death of a Salesman*, for there is no essential difference between his insistence and Willy Loman's that he be well liked.

Rule number three: Without impairing his vocation of reporting the truth as he sees it, an intellectual does well to retain a decent measure of tolerance for the prejudices of his society, however dismal. He should strive, at least in the normal course of his activity, to offer his solutions without anguish or indignation, for he should realize even more than other men how the emergence of unappreciated or unforeseen facts may make him wish that he had stayed in bed. Certain moral truths may be eternal, but they only achieve this status enclouded in general terms, where they can hover serenely, like Buddha's smile, above the sweaty problems of human application, their radiance providing inspiration rather than specific guidance. He is a schoolboy intellectual who does not acknowledge that in the human world good and evil have such an affinity for one another that, after the manner of women in a polygamous society, the fair one will sometimes yield only to the man who also weds her ugly sisters. As other men, an intellectual is obliged to do the best he can, but a knowledge that that best is never certain to accomplish its aim is as desirable in an intellectual as it is in nonintellectuals. The mulishness of his countrymen may, for all he can definitely know, save him from having to witness one of his brilliant mistakes grinding into action.

Finally, the business of being an intellectual requires some sophisti-

cation about the nature of culture, in the anthropological sense of that word. Good or bad, the traditions men receive from their predecessors distinguish them from animals. It is literally true that nauseous traditions would be better than none, for traditions of any sort are proof that man's development is not confined to what he can learn in a single lifetime. But the extent to which he can change his customs in any one generation without inviting disaster has its limits, regardless of how desirable, abstractly considered, such changes might be. An intellectual must, like a good psychiatrist, resign himself to the fact that a solution which the patient cannot accept without undue resistance is no solution. His failure to do so gives him the character of an intellectual trifler and rightfully provokes contempt on the part of politicians and others who, in their own way, achieve maturity by respecting the limitations of their culture.

Placatory Remarks

Like other human beings, the American intellectual would rather be admired than analyzed. Instead of pressing him further, I shall just add some protestations in order to demonstrate that I am bent on a mere lover's quarrel and not a crime of passion.

I would not give the impression that the intellectual should possess no firm convictions. He may possess as many of them as his study of events has brought him to. What makes him an intellectual in this respect, and sets him apart from other intelligent people with firm convictions, is only his matador's readiness to confront the hour of truth and risk his convictions with grace, style, and regularity.

Nor does this conception of the intellectual dehumanize him. Lawyers subdue their righteous impulses in arguing a case, regardless of how convinced they are that the opposition exhibits the grossest effrontery in contesting the matter. Are lawyers inhuman? Medical students learn to cut on human bodies without grievous distress. This takes some learning, but it does not result in many students becoming ghouls. I doubt that we need worry about stunting the intellectual's emotional life. No one is suggesting that he make love, raise a family, tender mortgage payments, and receive traffic tickets without emotion. However professional his search for truth in his capacity as an intellectual, the rest of his life will give him many opportunities to scream his head off like a normal human being.

Finally, an intellectual has a right to stop being an intellectual at any time. His changing his role may result in glorious consequences, as when many gifted individuals abandoned the schoolroom and the study before and during the American Revolution. The point is simply that when an intellectual goes all-out for politics, he cannot retain that special

privilege which rightfully protects him as an independent thinker. When present-day activists who submit to party discipline are caught in the intellectual henhouse, their usual defense is to flap their arms indignantly, scratch up the dust, and cackle to the best of their ability that nobody's here but us chickens. But these activists are not intellectuals as I perceive the species. They may have been at one time, and they may become intellectuals again. But as long as they remain under orders, their freedom signed over to higher authority, they must expect to be treated as nonintellectuals treat one another in conflict, without extra consideration for their social and economic well-being. I doubt that Nathan Hale complimented the British on their dexterity with rope, but there is no record that he wailed bitterly that this was a fine way to treat a college man.

Professor by Merit

(For S. F. D., Emeritus, 1958)

Dignity: to balance verbals with the anxious care
of college bulletins; to wear one's hair
pale as a new note card, and hat and shoes
sober as failing students' interviews?

Pride: to have had grace to survey nearly half
a century's freshman themes, knowing when to laugh
and sigh in ninety thousand paragraphs?

Honor: to nibble chicken roasted in one's praise
and afterward digest a cooked-up phrase
or colleagues' resolutions, or hear sent
personal congratulations from the president?

This: your balanced verbal sketches demonstrate
that Dignity is skeletal, the stay
of structures planned and raised with purpose, tall,
white, and grave; but cautious words are gray
paint and plaster fit for hollow walls;
that Pride is more than grace to contemplate
amalgam forms: it gathers when a strait,
pure discipline of self groups its estate;
that Honor is no banquet praise to parts
inert or final; it is what reveres
the maker's life of ceaseless craft and art.
Without a glance back at apprentice years,
Therefore, you bring us master-plans to fabricate.

Philip Appleman

Indiana University

In Corporibus Sanis

By MILTON MILLHAUSER
University of Bridgeport

I can appreciate the coach's point of view, but he simply is not being a very good sport about it. After all, the situation is just as difficult for our fellows. They grow so terribly discouraged at times, and I must say his attitude is not calculated to raise their spirits. Yet was it not from him that we learned, after an apparent defeat at the hands of what turned out to be a virtually professional team from State, that the scoreboard does not tell the whole story? These boys too (I use his very phrase) play clean, and fight their gol-darnedest. I wonder if he realizes how difficult it is for them to engage in the sport at all without their spectacles.

Moreover, was it not actually he who struck the spark? If it had not been for his eloquence at the '53 rally, his insistent urging that, contrary to my custom, I attend. . . . There was the hard logic of his talk; and something too, I confess, about the atmosphere in which it was delivered: the campfire, the torchlight, the pretty and vivacious cheerleaders, the deep-throated singing; it was the interplay of such factors (and not, as he insists, the modest sip of brandy I had taken against a threatening cold) that ultimately persuaded me that athletic endeavor may appropriately represent the ideals of an academic institution to the outside world. Always provided—the coach very properly stressed this point—that there is no dependence on the disingenuous practice of employing "ringers" who do not actually meet the usual scholastic standards: a vice we have so often and so discouragingly encountered at State. (Indeed, it is remarkable that we, as a strictly amateur organization, succeed in besting them as frequently as we do. Our strength is as the strength of ten, in roughly every second season.)

Yes, I was obliged to agree with the coach; for the development of efficiency in scholarship, "spirit" was the great desideratum; *mens sana* demanded, in some measure at least, *corpore sano*. (How is it, by the by, that this hallowed phrase is never cited, whatever the construction in which it occurs, save in the ablative?) Perhaps minds of my particular bent were inclined to deny physical prowess its true importance in the world of ideas. Had not Pindar composed odes to Olympic champions,

under circumstances not altogether dissimilar to those of today's bowl games? (Though the coach should not have attributed these to Sappho; she was not, so far as I have been able to determine, interested in contests of this description at all.) Fancies thronged my mind. Suppose the young men who gathered about Socrates had. . . . Or a Peripatetic discus team, attracting speculative minds to the Lyceum. . . . I fear I may have been nodding a little (I am unaccustomed to late hours); but I sat up abruptly and thrust idle dreaming from my thoughts. An idea of the utmost practicality had occurred to me.

I stress the circumstance; for the coach accuses me of having been drowsily inattentive, whereas the fact is that at this point I was intensely wide awake and paying the most painstakingly close attention. A number of students (one of whom very considerately urged me to fortify myself further against my cold) will bear me out. But indeed, I need no evidence beyond my familiarity with the then current stage of his discourse. Actually, nothing appears to irritate the poor fellow more than my citing his own arguments—frequently verbatim—against his prejudice. It is precisely at such moments that he becomes most stubborn and abusive. His tactics, however, are such as must make but a slight impression on a thinking man. Much of what he affirms as fact is both inaccurate and beside the point. If the issue were at all relevant, I could very readily demonstrate that my mother. . . .

II

The coach had been dwelling, with a fullness of demonstration that is characteristic of his platform style, on the justification of athletic scholarships. These constitute an honorable device, on which our excellence in athletic competition is largely based; he was at some pains to establish its propriety, as against the outright use of money to lure athletes to the campus, under the mere pretense of membership in the student body, engaged in by institutions of inferior caliber, such as State. Now, the fact is that I can repeat his every argument: the interdependence of physical and mental alertness; the increasing intellectualization of such contact sports as football and lacrosse; the practical utility, to the school's academic departments, of a spirited team of young scholars, by which the merits of the institution's pre-professional courses of instruction can be made generally known; and, not least, perhaps, the direct scholastic advantages of a scheme which brings to college a group of deserving students whose grades in secondary school have, through one freak or another, not quite entitled them to scholarships of the conventional sort. At one time I should have raised quibbling objections to certain of his points; for instance, I have had in elementary Latin mem-

bers of the football squad who did not consistently bring to their studies that clear-headed enthusiasm which the coach represents as the invariable concomitant of muscular vigor. But he has long since cleared away my doubts and scruples, with a force of logic for which I cannot stint my admiration. Yet even this becomes another basis for complaint against him. If I can be understanding with his people, why cannot he with mine? For I repeat: I accept his arguments without reservation, and have done little more than transpose them, so to speak, into another key. I grant freely, nay enthusiastically that *mens sana* dwells (all other circumstances being equal) in *corpore sano,* and that the student body derive some indefinable scholastic benefit from watching their fellows exhibit their prowess on the playing-field. Yet just there was the rub. The students who were thus privileged to elevate the intellectual standards of the school, while simultaneously promoting their own mental acuity—why should they stem so uniformly from the Department of Athletic Science?

That man had no right to accuse me of underhandedness; no right whatever. I shall never understand the twist of fate that made me Dean; though I must continue to insist that my chancing to encounter the President as he emerged from the stage-door of a theatre of dubious reputation—this trivial episode, I say, has obviously no bearing on the lucubrations of our Legislative Council of Trustees. Still less do I apologize for the quirk in our constitution (drafted, to be sure, by me, but approved by the President and Trustees) whereby, for a few hours one afternoon, absolute authority over school policy resided in my hands alone. These are clearly matters past his ken. But certainly, granted these most unusual circumstances, he would not have had me refrain from putting my cherished project into execution? As for "sneaking one over on" him, I contend that it was more than ordinarily candid of me to take him into my confidence just as soon as my mind had been made up. We had a stimulatingly frank discussion. Actually, though, I had expected him, with all the outdoor exercise he must enjoy, to have a far more objective mind. *Mens sana,* I kept telling him. If an all-American tackle cannot look dispassionately at both sides of things, who can? But mental lucidity seems to have deserted him; perhaps coaching, as opposed to actual participation in sport, is a relatively sedentary occupation. And I felt that I detected signs of emotional strain. A number of his statements about my personal habits—which in any case he can hardly have had the opportunity to observe—are patently inaccurate.

III

Well! my real concern at the moment is less to justify my action—which was as legal and reasonable as anything else in the history of our

institution—than to undertake a brief evaluation of our little experiment, now that the trial period has terminated. And I, for one, am unqualifiedly proud of the results.

Note, as a starting-point, that the scheme is heavily—far too heavily—weighted in favor of the traditional arrangement. This is a piece of frank sentimentality, a concession to the coach's feelings which, in the light of his subsequent behavior, I have come to regret. Still, there it is. We allow him a four-year period of athletic scholarships; this, according to his view of things, "beefs up" the team. Then, when conditions are, from his point of view, most favorable, my new concept comes into play.

This is no more than a sort of inverted athletic scholarship; I call it a Scholastic Starship. Just as his plan admits students of demonstrated athletic competence into our institution (often in spite of really disheartening academic records) and entitles them to a certain very trifling leeway in the matter of classroom performance; so mine admits students of established intellectual competence to stellar positions on the various varsity teams (occasionally, I admit, without too direct reference to their physical qualifications), and entitles them to the same good-natured indulgence in the event of blunders on the field. Thus the benefits on which the coach lays such stress—aggressiveness, team spirit, the sharpening of the intellectual faculties in moments of crisis—are no longer reserved for vigorous young men who have already prospered under much the same regimen in secondary school, but become available for those who most drastically need them, our once cloistered scholars.

It is unfortunate, to be sure, that only a small number of the most distinguished of these can participate directly in the energizing activities of the various teams. The improvement in their basic health (if one disregards contusions and other temporary, if painful, concomitants of contact sports) is marked. It is quite as much to the point that, *mutatis mutandis*, a comparable transformation has overtaken the so-called "rooters"—that is to say, a large part of the general student body. Indeed, the undergraduate paper, from which I am not accustomed to such displays of generosity, has been kind enough to term what has happened to this group incredible. The crowds are perceptibly smaller, to be sure; but their quality, gentlemen—their quality is outstanding. And these are the very young folk we wish to lure out of doors, into the crisp November sunshine; not the robust, extroverted sort who hitherto monopolized attendance at our games, deriving no particular benefit therefrom beyond the bare enjoyment of them, but our most earnest and devoted scholars, accustomed to the unhygienic atmosphere of the library, who now derive intellectual stimulus from what the coach himself has not infrequently designated as "a change of pace."

As for the coach's resignation, I suggest that we accept it without

comment, save that we may wish him godspeed at an institution organized more nearly in accord with his conceptions. I am confident that such exist. (There is always State.) But it ill becomes him to grumble about "bookworms." Has he not himself declared that football has become a highly intellectual game? Well, he now has a starting line-up with a median I. Q. of 187.5. If the team has gone scoreless for nineteen consecutive games, it can hardly be said to be the fault of the raw material. The coach asked for brains, and by George, gentlemen, he got them.

I reiterate: the results of our experiment are all that I had hoped for. To be sure, certain of the linesmen have proved a little shaky on declensions after a particularly strenuous game; but fortunately, the coach clarified the workings of his system to me years ago, and I realize that we must wait till spring for the athletically nurtured *corpore sano* (again the ablative!) to take its full effect. Systole and diastole. . . . As for the team's actual performance on the field, it is, to my mind, eminently satisfactory. There is no lack of spirit, or of dogged determination, and our players go down fighting—as well as they are able. One recalls the after-State-game rally of four years ago, in which the coach affirmed explicitly that these criteria alone are to be consulted.

True, no blessing is unmixed; I find that I cannot give extended assignments over weekends during the football season. Moreover, Friday's classes suffer intermittently from symptoms of nervous anxiety, and Monday's occasionally manifest traces of what, in less splendid fellows, I should be tempted to call torpor. But the general health of such students as are able to attend class at all has improved amazingly, and it follows logically that their mental attitude is correspondingly more alert and keen.

There is, finally, the question of the growing fame of our school, both in circles academic and in the minds of the populace. I venture to say that no comparable institution has ever been so generally a topic of conversation before; ours is notoriously the first liberal arts college to merit seven consecutive feature articles in *Life*. The academic consequences are, as one might expect, gratifying. Admissions reports that while applications for the new semester are still down, almost no one has been processed who is not more nearly fitted for a graduate than for a freshman program. The single section I still teach has become a delight rather than a routine task, and I am assured that the experience is not exceptional. The morale of our entire instructional staff—with the curious exception of the Department of Athletic Science—has improved astoundingly. I have it in confidence from one in high office (the President was not unaccompanied on that occasion) that never before has there been less grumbling over salaries. There is some talk of dispensing with increments altogether next year.

IV

And now, if I may be permitted one final comment, I should like to advert briefly to the coach's last athletic-scholarship team. They are seniors now, you will recall, and have not played for some time. But again I must protest: it is of a piece with the coach's injustice and irascibility that he should refer to them as "stranded." None of them, indeed, has demonstrated the intellectual capacity to make the varsity—or is it jayvee?—under the new dispensation, but many of them have done their fraternities yeoman service in the now exceedingly popular intramurals. But what is truly of moment is that, far from being stranded, they are first finding themselves; the splendid muscle-tone they developed during their freshman year is still returning intellectual dividends. Reports from all quarters agree on the high level of their performance; however, I prefer to speak only of the few I know. Pumper Mulligan is doing a really very creditable Honors paper on the Eleatic School, and Bozo O'Dowd has evinced a pretty little talent for the composition of erotic verse in both Greek and Latin, for which it is a pity that there is no fit contemporary audience. As for Bogoroslayevich (the only four-letter freshman, I am informed, in the history of the conference), it is true that he is deserting us for one of the pretentiously large Eastern universities, but I am bound to respect his reason for so doing. He has no use for a Classics Department, he tells me, that does not offer even Intermediate Etruscan.

The American Society of Criminology was recently organized for the purpose of fostering training and research in criminology in institutions of higher learning and in law enforcement and correctional agencies. Professor John P. Kenney of the University of Southern California was installed as President of the Society at its meeting in Los Angeles, January 31–February 1, 1958. The Society invites all persons dedicated to improvement of the police and correctional fields to apply for membership to the Secretary-Treasurer, Professor William Dienstein, Fresno State College, Fresno, California. An article on college and university courses in law enforcement will appear in the Autumn *Bulletin*.

Before You Say "Yes" to an Overseas Assignment

By PETER F. OLIVA
University of Florida

More Americans are embarking on programs of overseas assignments each year. An estimated 300,000 American civilians are working in jobs around the world. Teachers and administrators at all levels from the elementary school through the university level are being offered chances to participate in a wide variety of programs, some of which are sponsored by the U. S. government, others by private companies, institutions, and foundations.

Many of these jobs take you to the off-beat countries of the world, to the lesser-developed areas of the globe. The overseas assignment may be the most rewarding experience of your professional career. To make it even more rewarding, both professionally and economically, this author, recently returned from an assignment in the Middle East, suggests a few of the questions you should ask before accepting your overseas assignment. The answers to these questions were learned the hard way, either through personal experience or through the experiences of friends and acquaintances.

If time, hardship, and money mean little to you, these questions may appear trivial. On the other hand, if time, hardship, and money are important to you and to your family, full answers may save you countless headaches and heartaches. Here are some suggestions of what to look for and what to look out for.

1. (a) Exactly what is the job for which you are being employed? What are the duties, responsibilities, and hours of work? Some countries work on a split day: work in the morning, siesta in the afternoon, and work again in the evening. Are you expected to be on duty twenty-four hours a day? (b) Can you be shifted from one type of employment to another without your consent? (c) How much official entertaining will you be expected to do? You should have details of the job spelled out specifically in writing.

2. (a) What is the exact location of the job? (b) Can you be

transferred from one location to another without your consent? You should consult your geography books before you agree to unlimited transfer. There are few modern conveniences in some of the remote corners of the earth. (c) Will the job necessitate travelling? Can your constitution stand the pounding it will get in a jeep tearing along on some of the gravel roads of this world?

3. What will be your base salary? This is the figure to which additional benefits are added. For a married man with a family, $5000 would be a rock-bottom base salary to accept in some posts.

4. What other financial benefits are added to your base salary? (a) Look for cost-of-living adjustments. In Paris, for example, you would be hard-pressed financially without a cost-of-living supplement. (b) Hardship posts merit a post differential. This is a fixed percentage of your base salary, varying from 10% to 25%, to compensate you for health hazards, possible riots and revolutions, and the unpleasantness of isolation in remote areas. Posts are rated for differential by the Department of State. The differential may vary from year to year depending on conditions in the country. Since post differential is calculated on a straight percentage of your base salary, it is obvious that you should obtain the highest base salary which your job can carry. The higher the post differential, the higher the total salary, but also, the greater the hazards. (c) Your employment should provide quarters allowance or free housing in place of quarters allowance. A married man with family should receive a minimum of $200 a month in quarters allowance. Upper echelon employees of the U. S. government receive more. (d) Will you receive an allowance for the official entertaining which you are expected to do? This can be an expensive item.

5. Whose payroll will you be on? The U. S. government's payroll? Which agency's? If you are thinking of staying with your foreign assignment for several years, you should try to check the stability of your position. In an economy drive it is possible you might be "riffed" or cut.

6. If you are working for the U. S. government, are you officially an "employee," or are you on a contract or a grant? There are downward gradations of privileges and benefits for Americans abroad from "employee" to tourist (lowest species). For U. S. government workers, employee status is generally more desirable. You are then eligible for the maximum in benefits which government employees receive. Recipients of Fulbright scholarships are grantees. Binational center personnel, selected by the U. S. Information Agency, are grantees, usually. Grantees have neither civil service nor foreign service status, nor are they covered under social security provisions.

7. (a) Will you be paid entirely in dollars? If not, check to see what portion of your salary will be paid in dollars and what portion in

local currency. Insist on payment in dollars, if possible. If not, as with the Fulbright Act, which pays you entirely in local currencies, you will need to make provision at home for bills coming due and which must be paid in dollars. (b) What portion of your salary will be subject to taxes? You will want to check on income taxes levied both by the United States and by the host country. Base salary and post differential are subject to U. S. income tax. You should find out also how much local currency you can legally convert into dollars when you leave the foreign country. There are various restrictions on this transaction.

8. What additional benefits are there? Do you receive the privilege of purchasing at the U. S. Commissary? This is a "must" for comfortable living in the under-developed countries. If there is an A.P.O. or F.P.O., are you entitled to use this mail service? If there is a U. S. hospital or dispensary, are you and members of your family permitted to use it? Do you receive medical attention for yourself and members of your family without charge? What help can you expect if you or any member of your family is injured or falls ill from some hazard not commonly found in the United States? If there is no hospital, A.P.O. or F.P.O., or U. S. Commissary, or if you are not entitled to use these facilities, what provisions are made as substitutions for these necessities?

9. What kind of passport do you receive? There are three classifications: diplomatic, special, and regular. Since you are not likely to qualify as an official diplomat, you will receive either a special or a regular passport. Try to wangle a special passport, if possible. It carries a few minor immunities which the regular passport does not.

10. (a) Do you receive round-trip transportation for yourself and your family? In some of the programs you must pay for the transportation of your dependents. In others you must agree to stay at your post a stipulated period of time in order to receive transportation for your dependents. Do you receive your round-trip tickets when you leave for your assignment? Receipt of the tickets in advance is an excellent type of insurance and a great comfort in moments of stress. (b) May your dependents accompany you, or must they follow later? If they must follow later, how much later?

11. (a) Do you get your household effects shipped both ways at the expense of the employer? How many pounds of air freight and ocean freight will you receive? (b) Will your automobile be shipped both ways for you at the employer's expense? Five to ten thousand pounds of ocean freight for a family, 100 pounds of air freight per person, shipment of an automobile, and, in some cases, a few pounds of excess air baggage are common allowances for U. S. government personnel. You should remember to insure your effects and your car against fire, damage, loss, and theft both while in transit and while at your place of residence

abroad. You will also need to carry automobile liability and property damage insurance, if you operate a car abroad. If you have a valid U. S. driver's license from one of our states, you will find it easy to obtain an international driver's license for approximately seven dollars a year.

12. (a) Will you have assistance in getting your goods and car through the customhouse of the foreign country? This can be a formidable task. Will the U. S. embassy or consulate assist you? Are you entitled to ship your goods to the foreign country under the U. S. ambassador's free entry franchise? (b) What kinds of goods will you have to pay duty on? Some electrical appliances and all automobiles bear duty. Will you be compensated in some way, perhaps in your base salary, for expenditures for customs duties? These duties can be stiff—*e.g.*, 30% duty on the value of an automobile.

13. To whom are you responsible? How many Americans and how many nationals are your bosses? The number of superiors may vary with your rank and assignment. If you are working for the U. S. government, you will find abroad a rather rigid protocol hierarchy.

14. Does your contract or grant stipulate the number of days of sick leave and annual leave with pay? These items should be written down rather than left to the discretion of your superior. Superiors vary in their philosophies regarding leave.

15. What are the common hazards you may expect to find at your foreign post? Are you liable to find yourselves in the midst of a political upheaval or of a shooting fracas? Is there pure water readily available? What about sanitation, dairy supplies, refrigeration of foods, handling of vegetables, unusual diseases, etc.? What precautions must you take to protect yourselves from these perils? Such information you should find out in advance. If you are going with a U. S. government program, ask permission to read the U. S. State Department's report on the post to which you are going, before you accept the job. This report gives you factual—although not always current—information about the locale. Double check every item of information. Americans go abroad in large numbers with misinformation which causes them considerable difficulty.

16. What kind of educational facilities are available for your children? Is there an American Dependents' School? Will the local schools prove suitable for an American child? Do you receive an educational allowance to cover tuition costs, if any, for your children? U. S. government personnel receive an educational allowance of approximately $360 per child per year.

17. (a) Will you have to find housing on the local economy, or will the employer supply housing? (b) What basic furniture will the employer supply? What items of furniture need you ship? What good items of furniture and furnishings are available at reasonable prices on

the local market? Policies vary from shipment of all household effects to the foreign post to complete furnishing of housing at the post.

18. How much money will you need on hand before you receive your first pay check? You will need a ready supply of dollars for conversion into the foreign currency. You will also find it desirable to take along a small supply of the foreign currency for initial expenses, such as taxis, tips, etc. You can get your best exchange rates at the free markets, such as New York, Geneva, Tangier, and Beirut. Countries vary in the amounts of currency they permit to be taken in and out.

19. Will you and your family receive any training and orientation before you leave? You will find orientation on the people, geography, and customs of the country especially valuable. You should have at least a minimum of instruction in the language of the country.

20. What kind of electrical current does the country have? You will need transformers if you want to use your American electrical appliances in areas which do not have 110–115 volt current. Many countries have 220-volt, 50-cycle current. Incidentally, your record-player will need a converter if the cycles differ, as well as a transformer if the voltage is different.

21. Can you get a leave of absence from your own institution? Unless you plan to make a career of the foreign service, it is highly desirable to obtain a leave of absence.

22. What is the climate of the country? What kind of clothes should you take? Will you need formal clothes for social affairs? If you hop down to South America in June, you might wish you had taken a topcoat along.

23. What about the availability of reliable servants? With the problems of shopping, keeping house, and caring for the children, you will need clean, honest, and dependable servants. Contrary to what you may believe, it is not essential that the servants know English. In fact, many times their unfamiliarity with the language is a blessing.

24. What immunization shots will you and your family need? Will you be reimbursed for these and other incidental expenses, such as passports, photos, certificates, etc.?

25. Do you have your choice of mode of transportation—by sea or by air? You and your family should receive first-class transportation. You should be permitted to select air or sea or a combination of the two. The U. S. government authorizes for its personnel only direct routing, but many combinations are possible within this limitation. As an additional tip, plan your trip before you leave. With free air stopovers, for example, you could plan a circular trip, going to your post by one route and returning by another.

26. For how long a period after you arrive at your foreign post

may you still order goods from the United States on your household weight allowance? U. S. government personnel may order goods shipped on their weight allowance for six months after their arrival at the post. A small percentage of this allowance may be for foodstuffs.

One final suggestion: Try to schedule your departure and your arrival home to coincide with the academic year, so that you will be on a payroll without long interruption.

It is the belief of the author that the more information you have before you go abroad, the more you will enjoy your assignment and the better emissary of America you will be. It is true that this article appears to emphasize privileges and benefits. Emphasis on legitimate benefits which the individual may receive and which many individuals abroad do receive in no way minimizes the primary functions of service, duty, and responsibility. The "average" American, however, will be more effective in his overseas assignment if he is healthy, happy, and reasonably secure.

More than 100 distinguished scientists from all fields and all parts of the nation assembled in Washington, D. C., on March 15–17 for the 1958 Parliament of Science, conducted under the auspices of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. A summary of their deliberations appeared in *Science* for April 18, 1958. Among the statements adopted by the Parliament were the following:

The freedom we cherish is served and strengthened by science. Science must also share in this freedom. In the long run it is not possible to have vigorous and imaginative science unless society is willing to provide a total climate, within which scientists work, which assures freedom of choice of problems, freedom to travel, freedom to communicate, freedom to disagree. There appear to be no qualifications to the choice here posed: a full intellectual freedom for scientists, or a weak and declining science.

Although this Parliament of Science quite properly concentrated on problems of science and public policy, and although some of the recommendations are quite specific to science, it must be emphasized that science represents only one part of intellectual endeavor. Both public policy and the welfare of science require an educational system that is strong at all levels and in all fields of knowledge. Efforts to advance science at the expense of other fields of learning would harm all fields of learning and the society they serve.

The Technological University of Budapest

By MICHAEL S. SAMSONOW
Loyola University of Los Angeles

The leading role played during the Hungarian National Revolution in 1956 by Hungarian students, especially by those of the Technological University, drew the attention of the world to this great educational institution. The University, which, until the occupation of Hungary by the Soviet Army, was known as the Royal Hungarian Palatin Joseph University of Technical and Economic Sciences of Budapest, was one of the leading educational centers of Central Europe.

The University was not only known for its very high academic and scholastic standards and for the research work of its scholars in the many scientific fields, but also as an inexhaustible reservoir of statesmen, diplomats, politicians, and many other experts whose knowledge and experience were often sought by the government. At the same time, the University, strongly adhering to the principle of "the right man in the right place," entrusted highly qualified governmental officials with the teaching of their respective fields. In general, the overwhelming majority of the instructors were well known authorities in their domains, and, as most of them were versed in several foreign languages, they often represented Hungarian science at international conferences, thus increasing greatly the prestige of the University both at home and abroad. The annual reports of the Rector Magnificus always contained a long and impressive list of publications and results of the research done by the scholarly instructors. The *Müegyetemi* professors, as they were called, were held in high esteem by all strata of Hungarian society and were greatly respected for their general culture, erudition, and constant contributions to science.

During the years I studied and taught at the Palatin Joseph University, there were many scholars called from the faculty to serve the nation in connection with their fields. One of the Deans was a former Royal Minister of Education, while another left the chair of statistics to become a Minister of Industry and Communications. The professor

of comparative public law was a member of the Upper House of the Parliament and Rapporteur of its Legal Committee; his colleague, a professor of criminal law, was Deputy-Secretary of State in the Ministry of Justice. Economics was taught by a member of the Upper Chamber of the Hungarian Parliament; sociology by a member of the Lower Chamber; and financial law by a former president of the National Bank. The professor of geopolitics was a former Minister of Foreign Affairs, and another professor was Vice-President of the Hungarian Parliament. The latter often came directly from the Legislature, over which he presided, and shared his vast knowledge and experience with his students. This rare combination of scholar-statesman and theory and practice contributed largely to the formation of a particularly high general culture of the students.

Prewar Hungary has a reputation of having been feudal. Asked by some of my American colleagues to compare a university of a feudal country with a university of democratic America, I could only tell them this: "In a Hungarian university the faculty members elected from their midst, for an annual term, the deans and the president of the university. In democratic America, the university deans and the president are appointed for an indefinite period of time, and without the knowledge, consent, and advice of the faculty."

The best known Rector Magnificus, who was elected to that high office several times by the faculty, was Count Paul Teleki, professor of political geography. On various occasions, this scholar was asked to interrupt his teaching to serve his country as Prime Minister, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Minister of Education. As Premier of Hungary, on December 12, 1940, he signed a treaty of friendship with Yugoslavia. Being confronted four months later with Hitler's demand to let the German armies cross his country in order to attack Hungary's new friend, Yugoslavia, the former professor of political geography, upon realizing the geopolitical powerlessness in this situation of his small nation, committed suicide.

Now, fifteen years later, students of the same university have given their answer to the demands of another foreign dictatorship.

Freshman Illiteracy and Professorial Jeopardy[1]

By RICHARD B. HOVEY
Western Maryland College

At first glance, freshman English may seem too trivial and special a subject to concern most college teachers. Yet none of us can ignore the sheer magnitude of its operations. With negligible exceptions, it is the one course which each and every one of our three million college students must take. And my personal guess is that nearly 10,000 instructors are engaged in thus perpetrating among our youth the discipline of the first two *R's*. Putting quantity aside, however, freshman English has a more serious claim on our attention. If we keep our perspective while we look closely at this course, at the assumptions behind it, at its ends and means, and at the forces working upon it, it will serve as a microcosm where we can observe the conditions faced not merely by English instructors but by humanities teachers generally. Narrowly, such an examination would seem to interest the English specialist merely. In a broader sense, the questions involved are crucial to the status and function of all professors in America today.

In the freshman work, we English teachers seem not to aim too high. We try only to help our students acquire enough skill to put what is in their minds and hearts into some pattern of words which say what they mean and communicate intelligibly to a reader. We hope that by the time they leave our classes they will be competent at simple expository writing, the practical kind that goes into a business letter, a committee report, an office memorandum, a set of instructions. Usually, we meet our freshmen three times a week, instruct them in composition, assign them weekly themes, and (with no time-and a-half for overtime!) give perhaps more than an extra day's work each week to marking those piles of papers. In class we also lecture to and discuss with our charges carefully selected readings—readings intended to serve as models, stimulate thought, encourage self-expression, stretch imaginations,

[1] Opening address at the meeting of the Middle Atlantic Group of the College English Association, Washington, D.C., April 27, 1957; slightly revised for publication.

quicken sympathies, and make the young more aware of themselves and the world they live in.

And yet something goes wrong. When we meet the same students as sophomores and again as juniors, we have to scold them for abominable sloppiness on tests and examinations. In their final year, when some of our students are writing senior theses, we realize that they have forgotten nearly all they were supposed to learn in the freshman research paper. As the years go by, they bring to us repeatedly the queasy feeling that the youngsters who came into our freshman courses writing well went out of them also writing well and that those who entered as poor writers left as poor writers. Does this mean that we have failed in our efforts to help our charges meet the literacy requirement, the special responsibility of the English department? Probably a fair percentage of the populace supposes that this requirement has been met by most of those who graduate from our colleges. But we English professors have no such certainty. In fact, to judge by the talk among ourselves and by the complaints that come from beyond the groves of Academe, we are worried that in this land of the success story we may be among the sorry failures. Some of us even suspect we belong to a dying race. So, a regular part of our work has come to be the examining of our own professorial souls. And, on the defensive, we are likely to be awkward in the extreme.

Still, we are hardly pharisees if, after giving our consciences a good going-over, we conclude that we compare favorably with the nation's other specialists in knowing what we are about and in doing our best. Besides, our work is by no means confined to the classroom. Some of us have been publishing textbooks—of course, better ones, with a fresh approach, with an original but well-tested method. We have also been writing articles on these questions, attending meetings, serving on committees, preparing reports. Some among us say, "Let's call it communications." Others say, "Rather, it is all a matter of linguistics." Then, too, there is that avalanche, tons and tons of materials every month from the publishers—new handbooks, new workbooks, new anthologies, new outlines, new what-nots, new and ever-new and ever-ready gimmicks. What keeps the wheels going? As to those who publish, no doubt Mammon is a power-driving god. Nevertheless, behind all this swarming and buzzing of English professors might be some kind of faith—possibly almost a religious faith. I shall venture suggesting that the English professors' faith is that if only we face up to our responsibilities, if only we work hard enough, if only we devise enough methods, if only we are smart enough, if only we tinker enough with the wheels and cogs, we can somehow, during their few years in the college classroom, teach people how to write. Yet we ourselves remain doubting Thomases. And the rest of the world? It is still awaiting conversion.

II

To be sure, our unsuccess in teaching writing may in part be due to our own shortcomings as English professors. But I suspect that is a very small part of it. A much larger part centers in the average student who sits in the college classes. This boy does not share the faith. He is an infidel. He is sure he can achieve salvation without composition. He can get through college and get on in life without pother about correct writing and good literature. To say this, however, is not to shift the blame from our professorial to his adolescent shoulders. Rather, it is to raise the question: why is the freshman so unshaken in this conviction of his?

First of all, this boy or this girl has learned, during the four years before college, that he could pass through high school very nicely without stewing over his English. Nor was it personal laziness or indifference or anti-intellectualism which led him to conclude that English does not matter. He arrived at such an understanding because there was almost nothing in his high school experience to suggest anything different to him. Probably, many of his high school teachers of English were themselves poorly disciplined in their own subject matter. Yet even if the preparation of high school teachers becomes twice as rigorous as it now is, that same ill-prepared boy will put in his regular appearance in the freshman English course.

The reason is obvious. Even if every high school English teacher had every qualification we could dream of, she could do very little. For as everyone knows, the way to learn writing is to write. This means that the high school students will have to write at least one theme a week. Each of these the English teacher must painstakingly read and mark. Remember that she has five or six classes daily, has perhaps three different courses to prepare for, has between twenty-five and forty students in each class, and so takes home each week between 125 and 240 themes. If she devotes a scant five minutes to each paper, she must put in ten to twenty hours of over-time weekly. Can she do all this? Hardly—unless she has the heart of a Florence Nightingale, the brain of a Pallas Athene, and a physique of a Wagnerian Brunnehilde!

Besides, the high school English teacher is pretty sure to stand alone in her conviction that clear and accurate expression in our native tongue is an indispensable skill that ought to be required of the pupils. Whenever she frowns at one of her charges, the youngster can always counter: "Why do I have to write so perfect for you, Miss Penn, when Mr. Dill my zoology teacher and Mrs. Hanky my home ec teacher and Miss Clio in history will give me A if I just work hard and show the right attitude and just get all the material down on my tests?" Our English teacher has no answer to this. As to her colleagues, it is now

common knowledge that among our undergraduate population the men preparing to be public school teachers and administrators, when tested with their fellow-students for scholastic ability, make the lowest scores. Very recently, in a state whose educational system is perhaps among the best half-dozen in the nation, a friend of mine happened to be an instructor in an English course for teachers who were working for a master's degree; at the start he supposed he should be teaching them some of the finer points of composition; but so low was the level of literacy among his adult students that by the third week he was drilling them in rudiments which he himself had had to master in grade school.

III

The freshman English trouble is not merely with our high school teacher of English, nor with high school faculties generally. It lies with our whole system of secondary education in America and with the philosophy which dominates it. By the law of the land we are committed to keep within our educational institutions—until such time as the labor market can absorb them and they can go out and start families of their own—some eight millions of adolescents. A high percentage of these are, as things now stand, simply not educable. No sane teacher or educator ever dreams that all of these youngsters can to any degree prove competence in what used to be the high school curriculum: English, a foreign language, natural science, mathematics, and history. But we Americans have a foggy faith in numbers; and we are involved, for the first time in human history, in a gargantuan experiment in mass-schooling. Plainly, we cannot keep all these eight millions in school and at the same time maintain academic standards; that would mean being hard on the boys and girls—intellectually hard. So we have found a way out. Quite unconsciously, yet perfectly consonant with American conditions, there emerged a philosophy to guide our policy and our practice and to justify them both.

More than a half century ago, the pragmatist William James deplored what he called the "softer pedagogy." That softer pedagogy, however, was destined to become the credo of American precollege education. With the vital essence of John Dewey's wisdom there may be small reason to quarrel. But the priesthood which has become established in his name and which has petrified his discoveries into dogma and reduced his reforms to rituals is altogether another matter. For instance, William Heard Kilpatrick, the grand pundit of professional educationists, explained how the sacred fire descended upon him: Lo! he suddenly realized that he did not want to teach a subject, he wanted to teach students. From this dichotomy wonders aplenty have sprung. "The only satisfactory over-all or general objective for education,"

Kilpatrick asserts, "is the progressive building of the all-round character to meet all sides and aspects of a proper normal life." Here are Delphic vapors indeed, but we can translate the oracle well enough. It simply means that our high schools aim at that all-inclusive, multi-purpose notion called life-adjustment. Life-adjustment means nearly everything: fostering physical welfare, emotional health, group happiness, right attitudes, economic efficiency, civic responsibility, job-training, recreational activities, and—well, add anything else that occurs to you. In a word, the American high school is now a social service institution, and a noble one. But it is no longer an intellectual institution. It is no longer an educational institution as that term was formerly understood. It is a Martha, not a Mary. It is busy and troubled about too many things to be able to foster a respect for thought and the things of the mind.

The ill-prepared freshman, then, is bound to appear regularly in the first-year English course—and now in ever-increasing millions. And here is a curious thing about that course. Page through any first-year college algebra text; you will never find anything in it like times tables, long division, the multiplication of fractions, or sums in addition. For comparison, open a freshman English handbook; there you will find exercises on dependent and independent clauses, lists and samples of parts of speech, rules of spelling, directions on the use of a dictionary, and instructions on how to tell the difference between a sentence and a piece of one. It is hardly surprising that the public has never collated such texts. But it is astonishing that college professors have not only come to accept freshman English but also have come to accept the freshman English handbook without the flicker of an eyelash. Yet all these rudiments should have been learned in grade school; and they should have been so mastered as to be second nature to the college student.

IV

Besides the lacks in the average youngster's high school training, there are other reasons why the work he does in freshman English bears so little fruit. His gains in other college courses are probably greater. With reasonable intelligence and a fair amount of work, our freshman in, say, history, is pretty sure to learn a modicum anyway. At least, he is exposed to information; and osmosis may take effect. By its very nature, however, freshman English is different. Except for the readings, it does not call for the mere absorption of information. It is a self-help course, where the question of motivation is more complex. For example, compare freshman English with taking lessons on the contra-bassoon. If your contra-bassoon student meets his music teacher once or twice a week and does no more than listen to instructions and play a bit during

the lessons, he will never become a tolerable performer. He will never learn the instrument unless he really and truly wants to. If in truth he does want to learn, he will blow and blow on his contra-bassoon; and nobody will have to drive him to practice on his own. Now, hardly one freshman in a hundred will practice writing on his own in this way.

Why should he? English is merely one of his several courses. What right has his English professor to expect him to put more time in on composition than on biology? He makes B's in biology for knowing the material; why should he not also get B's in English for knowing the material? Meanwhile, the biology professor may complain to the English department: "Say, why can't you fellows teach these students how to write?" But rarely do other departments lower a student's grades for his inability to put into words precisely what he means to say. And of course an individual teacher or an English department cannot suddenly decide to have standards; let them fail half or more of each freshman class, and they will soon be in trouble with their administrators. So our student knows that unless he is fearfully deficient in writing and unforgivably negligent in doing his work, he will not fail freshman English and will get by in all his other courses. In other words, he is pretty sure he writes well enough anyway.

The discouraging fact is that the freshman is right in his views. He is without any genuine, deeply motivated reason for learning to write. It is doubtful that a faculty of pedagogical geniuses could give him one. He has no reason to care to imitate his teacher in the latter's passion for good prose—as the French boy in the lycée might wish to emulate his master. Our American student knows that, come spring of his senior year, if he has decent college record and has been a pretty good all-around fellow, the United Consolidated Corporation will be on campus to recruit him as a junior executive trainee at a starting salary every bit as good as that of his college teacher—and those C's and maybe that one D in his English courses will not hurt his chances at all.

V

To be sure, mine is only a composite portrait of our freshman. There are others—maybe a fair percentage of them—who do get the drift of what the English teacher is trying to do for them. These are the boys and girls alert enough to recognize something hard and rigorous about the craft of writing. It means effort, an effort that is always strenuous but would be easier now if they had learned the rudiments when they were younger. But in none of their previous schooling have they experienced anything like rigor in connection with English. Besides, college life offers many prompter rewards and greater charms

than those gained by sweating over one's vocabulary or straining one's wits over the structure of a sentence.

Surely, some students tug at the English teacher's heart. There is the boy who, let's say, wants to enter medical school; he is hard-working, with enough ability to earn respectable grades in science, but his composition is very poor and he knows it. His father is ambitious for him to become a doctor. Won't you help the boy? If he does some extra boning up in English, won't he possibly have a chance at a B in your course? We have to tell such a boy that boning up might do very well in some subjects; but that in English—well, art is long and life is short. We have to tell such a boy that the symbols of any art—music, painting, writing—are so hard that one must grow up with them as companions from childhood onward. And what can we say to the boy's father—the American parent so solicitous for his young, so glad to toil that Mary and Johnny will have the chance in life which he never had? Alas, nearly fifty years ago a wayward critic (who supposed that the future of civilization depends upon "what is read to children before they can read to themselves") was thinking of this parent. "An ignorant man makes a fortune and demands the higher education for his children," wrote this critic. "But it is too late: he should have given it to them when he was in his shirt sleeves."

I am not arguing, as it may seem, that teaching writing in college is an impossibility. But I do believe that most of the pain and waste in the required composition course comes from our incomplete awareness of how many cyclopean forces work against us. As Jacques Barzun has reminded us, the college and university do not operate "in a vacuum but rather in a vortex of destructive forces." We need not go beyond our academic walls to see that the whole American system of schooling, from kindergarten to post-doctoral research, is not geared to humane and liberal education. Except by the accident of God's grace, off our colossal assembly-line come only two products: the good citizen, well adjusted to our way of life-as-is; and the specialist technician who serves society in tangible ways—relines brakes in our car, raises chickens, removes a bad appendix, advises the President on fiscal matters.

We academic defenders of the humanities have indeed a heavy responsibility. Yet the guilt is not wholly ours. Nearly fifty years ago, John Jay Chapman warned against what he called the "miscarriage of education . . . through a perfectly unconscious adaptation of [the educators' souls] to the spirit of the age." He meant that when they began to urge young people to come to college on the ground that education would advance self-interest, they were guilty of a falsehood. Ironically, under such benevolence the educators concealed their doubt that the colleges could offer anything more valuable than vocational

training. This attitude masks a profound skepticism of the truth that man cannot live by bread alone. And yet it has become almost an article in America's credo that the prime reason for pursuing higher learning shall be self-interest, even economic self-interest. The acceptance of this view seems an established fact of history.

VI

By no means must we conclude, however, that our predicament is hopeless. Nor should we in our jeopardy sit and do nothing. We have, it seems to me, several possible lines of action.

First, of course, we can go on as we have been. While the temperature rises outside, we can charm our ears with our own fiddling. Or, to shift my figure, I mean that we can remain professors pure and simple; we can stay within our own departments and continually tinker with our big and complicated academic machinery—with curricula and methods and with specialists' articles written at one another. But merely to follow this line, we must, I believe, do even better for our best students. They are the forgotten men of the American high school. They are the ones who by some chance are already prepared for liberal education. From them will come whatever intellectual leadership America is to give the world. And since as eggheads they may be harshly tested in adult life, it is our grave responsibility to strengthen in them their capacity for self-reliant thought and action—to save them from the anesthetic of anonymity in the lonely crowd. For our average students, we might continue to go through the motions, the routine ritual to which they and society have become accustomed. Or else, so far as mere literacy goes, let us recruit gigantic English staffs and drill these students in grade-school rudiments. Such, it seems, might be our second possible line of action.

For our third possibility, I recommend that we dump our problems right into the lap where they belong—I mean society's lap. To do this is to relieve ourselves of the preposterous burden we have heaped upon our professorial conscience. Of course, we shall not be at ease. Every one of us knows that today the Ivory Tower is anything but a safe fortress or a place of Olympian calm. By night it rocks with every chill blast from opposing winds of doctrine. By day it is hot with the burning questions of our times. When I recommend that we dump our problems into society's lap, I am in reality asking that we sign up for the war—perhaps for Armageddon. I am calling for a fight. For I believe it is not beneath the dignity of an academician to make a fight for the truth he sees. Now is the time to take the offensive.

I mean that all of us college teachers must see ourselves as part

of this society as it actually is. I mean that we must face an American world which has a very ambivalent attitude towards the professor—fears him enough to bind him with loyalty oaths, still hunts for superlatives to praise him, and yet also makes of the professor stock material for a joke. We must assimilate the fact that even in this atomic age America still has ten times as many blacksmith shops as book stores. We must recognize that we live in a society which spends more for comic books than for all the textbooks used in elementary and high schools; which, for every dollar spent on schools, spends three for military purposes and nearly two for new automobiles; which spends for crime and delinquency six times the entire cost of all public education in the United States. We must realize that we work in a society which has no heart's reverence for intellect and which has only the dimmest notion of what the humanities and basic science are all about.

I am thinking of the freshman boy who seemed the quintessence of the way of the world when he told me, in a kind of cherubic cynicism, that the trouble with Thoreau was that he really wanted to make money but couldn't; and that the experiment at Walden and Thoreau's attack on heedless materialism are nothing but a phony rationalization of his own failure. I am thinking of the greatest professor in America today, young Charles Van Doren, who demonstrated to breathless millions that erudition can pay off, at least on television, at a ratio of some $4000 per annum to $129,000 in a few weeks. I am thinking of a religious convention in the nation's capital, swept into ectasies by a pamphlet written by one of the participating clergymen which had the thrilling title *Money Is God in Action!* In this American world, which often seems to have only the most cloudy suspicion that other values count, we professors—humanists and scientists both—with what friends we can muster, will have to take our case to the great public. If we do not, by our default other groups will shape the future of higher learning in America. They are already in the field, and many of them seem less competent in such matters than we are: the American Legion, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Advertising Council, etc. In this age—an age of mass communication—when the interaction of pressure groups seems so normal to the operations of our democracy, why is it, one wonders, that we professors are so strikingly inept at taking care of ourselves? Why—when at this historic moment the private interest of teachers and scholars happens to be at one with the public interest of our society? We professors must ourselves make our cause known to the American people. The problem is to find some organ—some fighting heart—some organization whereby we professors can make these other values, if not loved and treasured, at least felt and respected by society. Where there is no vision, the people perish.

Mama, Stay Away from my Door

A college professor says parents are more trouble than the students

By KEEN RAFFERTY
University of New Mexico

It was 8:15 A.M. of a recent summer's day at a New Mexico mountain resort, and it was the morning after some late hours for my wife and me at a party for a group of faculty people from the university where I am a professor. I had wandered dazedly into the cabin's kitchen in pajamas and robe and had somehow managed to pour a cup of instant coffee when there was a knock at the back door.

There was a moment of irritation and confusion inside what functioning gray matter I have at that period of the day. But I could see, through the curtain, that it was an attractive blonde in halter and shorts. Mystified, I moved toward the door, first checking to be sure I had put my bridgework in.

It was the startingly young mother of a 19-year-old son who was a transfer from Northwestern State Junior Normal, and she thought his transcript was in the registrar's office, and the tuition did seem high although maybe he's a resident and how much is that? What would he have to take if he were in the college of business administration, assuming all of Northwestern State's credits were accepted?

By the time I absorbed this, and shook another cobweb or two out of my eyes, and remembered that I am a kind of public servant, at a state university, and had better be nice, and quit worrying about whether the coffee was cold yet, I realized what the lady wanted. She wanted me to go to the registrar's office, get a copy of Tony's transcript, study the alien requirements of the college of business administration, and draw up a tentative schedule of classes.

Besides all that, it was a gamble, for Tony had a tennis scholarship at Northwestern State and we hadn't offered him one, and he might go back there after all.

Few students are as helpless as Tony seemed to be, or as busy (he's a good youngster, and was working hard digging ditches for the summer), and few mothers are worriers like this one, but her twenty minutes at

our cabin door that morning were not too far from the rule of what may happen to a professor. For a relatively small number of parents, fathers as well as mothers, can cause more trouble for university teachers and administrators than the students do.

II

Colleges seldom have great problems with students. They are organized to handle large numbers of young people, and things go along smoothly and happily enough, if the occasional solicitous mother or father just keeps out of the way.

Elizabeth, whose family lived here in our university town, was one of those students for whom everything does not go smoothly. If Elizabeth ever had a grade higher than a C it is beyond my memory. She was, besides, sure of herself, convinced that professors are ineffectual eccentrics, and interested primarily in how many dates she could have in a week. She was typical of a certain kind of minority student, and she was on her way out under the sympathetic but rigid system that universities have just for that purpose.

About this time, enter Mama. Elizabeth was a pledge to a social sorority, and she stood to be initiated at the start of the next semester if her grades averaged C. They did not, and one of the reasons was that she received a D from a professor in my department. Mother caught me in a hardware store, and here was trouble. What was expected of me this time was that I go back to the campus and order the professor to visit the registrar's office and officially alter Elizabeth's photographed record so that it would show a C. This I did not do.

When important fathers intervene for their sons and daughters, well-meaningly or no, there can be a crisis. Consider the matter of the campus vandals.

This one occurred in a neighboring state university where, for months, four difficult students had committed acts of destruction which culminated in the tearing down of a small building on the campus. As it usually does, the dean of men's machinery located the culprits, and this time it was impossible to call what had happened a boyish prank. The offending students were expelled. Two of them were the sons of well-to-do men in the community, known for their pugnacity.

The fathers of the other two students, men with less influence, seemed to realize that the boys had received what they had earned, and took it as it was. But the first two felt their own sense of importance outraged. There was an aftermath: the two men started with the university's president, went from there to the trustees, and entreated the state's governor to help them.

Pressures like this create ordeals for a university whose principal duty is to educate young men and women. A state university is supported mainly by the taxpayers and fees charged to students. It has obligations to every citizen, whether he is a student or the parent of a student, or not. It also has obligations to preserve its probity. It cannot remain self-respecting unless it stays honest. What, then, do the faculty, the academic and personnel deans, the president, the trustees, the governor do when such a thing happens? And what can be in the minds of fathers who are willing to attack their own state university simply to see their sons continue to be pampered in college as they have been at home?

Some parents act in denial of a university's function to impart broad cultural knowledge. Anne was a victim. She was a pleasant and normal girl of good social position, not much interested in college, but with one grand prejudice. She could not stand foreign languages, required in the college of liberal arts. Her mother drove 100 miles to town to take up the complaint.

"You *know* Anne doesn't want to take French," she told me. If Anne did not want it, Anne did not have to have it, in her parents' minds. They lifted her out of the University and sent her to Miss Prentice's, where teacups outrank German.

Deans of men and deans of women deal with this kind of thing almost daily. They must be on guard not to lose faith in young people, remembering that only a few go beserk, and to be patient with the well-meaning, loving, mistaken approaches of the occasional troublesome parent.

III

Lest this discussion seem harsh, it needs to be said that no sensible college professor assumes he knows more in general about what is good for a young man or woman than the parents do. It is the parent who has true permanent devotion to his children in most cases. It is the parent's money that is spent to send a boy or girl to college. It is the parent who has real rights where his son and daughter are concerned. What is being said here is not about most fathers or mothers, but about the ones who get excited and do something foolish. Sometimes what happens is more amusing than otherwise.

"Jimmy doesn't handle his money well," said a mother to a dean of students of my acquaintance. "His father and I have decided to work it out with you. We'll deposit the allowance with you, and then you can pass out some to him every other day. He'll just drop by and see you."

When the dean investigated to see who poor, insufficient little Jimmy was, he discovered a 200-pounder who played on the football

team, and who must have been dismayed to find that his parents trusted him so little. Besides, they had unwittingly arranged matters so that the boy now had to call not just when summoned, but regularly every other day, at the office of the dean, or go broke.

Among incidents which come about because of a parent's deep concern for his child was the case of Jane. She had had an illness when she was 12 years old, and her mother had never got over fretting about it, even though the doctors had told the family that there was no danger.

What the mother did was to write to the university's infirmary in such a manner that the infirmary staff, following a routine for such situations, sent form notices to all Jane's instructors stating that she might have an attack in class, and giving instructions as to what to do if she did. It took a real effort, at the infirmary and in class, for her to convince everybody that she did not need to be trailed by an ambulance.

Incredibly, another mother forced her son into the college of engineering because she had once been in love with an engineer, before she married the boy's father. Failing in nearly all his courses, the student held out for a week, in interviews with the university's counseling and testing services, before telling the directing psychologist why he hated his studies.

There are about three million college students in the United States, and that means almost six million parents, plus grandparents, uncles, and other relatives and guardians who sometimes intercede in behalf of youngsters. No wonder there seem to be so many angry or disappointed fathers and mothers, especially since less than half of those who start to college ever graduate.

The weeding-out devices are always at work. A student who has the mind and the health and the character and the desire to do it will graduate in good time. The one with little desire to have a degree, or with too little ability or too little stability, loses out and ordinarily quits. If he does not, the university drops him. This is the process. It works, and most of the time it is fair, and safeguarded with consideration for the student. Parental intervention can complicate a fairly simple matter, and work injustice on the student.

One of the most intelligent young men I ever knew lost out in college, I am convinced, because of his father. This man, a graduate of the eighth grade and successful in business, was impatient with learning and thought it a waste of time. Earl now runs his father's grocery company. He is secure for life. Perhaps college would have done little for him. Perhaps it would have done much. With encouragement, instead of discouragement, he might have done more, in time, than just to fill his father's shoes.

IV

The good student has great spirit, and great capacity for open-mindedness. He can take intellectual punishment; he can be humble, and at the same time confident in himself. He understands his university almost as well as does the experienced professor, and when a parent takes up a student's cause, the student is often embarassed or met with new difficulties. One of the hardest facts for many parents to face is that their child has grown up, and must make his own way. Mothers and fathers actually come to school with some students, escorting the unwilling young people to registration.

Professors who are fathers sometimes act like fathers, too, or overact that part. A teacher I know at an eastern school for girls, wrapped up in his daughter's life, worked hard every registration time to place her in courses which he thought would be easy for her, or with professors who he thought might give her extra consideration. There were no particular indications that she was hurt by his help, but she might have been better off to take the same risks every other student takes.

Good students want to work hard in college. They respect the professor who makes them work and keeps them interested, and from whom they can gain real knowledge and sense, and they secretly—or sometimes openly—are disdainful of the easy mark. They feel cheated when they do not learn. Every professor has glowed with hope and pleasure when a student comes up to him three months later and says, "That D you gave me was the best thing that ever happened to me." Or when a graduate stops by for a visit, greets his former teacher with the warmth of the old campus days, and tells him what a part he has played in the young man's success.

Parents should stay out of this fine relationship where possible, and appreciate it from the sidelines for what it is worth. Thank goodness, that is what most of them do.

As for the blonde at the cabin door that morning, I did it. I spent two hours next day working for Tony, or perhaps I should say working for his mother. I am sure that getting Tony's materials together did her more good than him.

Let's Bury the "Liberal"

By Benjamin Brickman
Brooklyn College

No, the reference is not to an adherent of a certain ideology, but to a word—a word which, after losing its original meaning, has been subjected to a variety of re-interpretations. Now, it is a commonplace that words take on new connotations from time to time and thus contribute to the growth of language. When, however, a word is retained with an almost worshipful attitude and new meaning read into it so as to justify a particular point of view, that is something else again. And this is what happened to "liberal," in order to provide a mask of justification for preconceived views on education.

"Liberal" started out in life as a social criterion for the pursuit of certain studies—liberal studies were those worthy of the attention of the aristocrat, the gentleman, the "free" citizen. Moreover, even a cursory examination of the content of what was regarded as liberal in antiquity reveals interesting divergencies. The Greek ideal laid more emphasis on intellectual and artistic achievements, while in the Roman ideal, as expounded by Cicero, certain practical arts were added. For example, in discussing the education of the gentleman—*liberales doctrinae atque ingenuae* (*De Oratore*, III, xxxii)—Cicero includes a description of the *occupations* suitable to an aristocrat (*artificium liberale* or *quaestus liberalis*):

> Now, in regard to trades and other means of livelihood, which ones are to be considered becoming to a gentleman, and which ones are vulgar, we have been taught, in general, as follows. . . .(*De Officiis*, I, xlii)

Cicero goes on to associate the ordinary trades as suitable to the lower classes, making a special point of the occupation of retail merchant, which, because of the practice of misrepresentation associated with it, is beneath the gentleman. As for the liberal occupation, Cicero has this to say:

> But the profession in which either a higher degree of intelligence is required, or from which no small benefit to society is desired—medicine and architecture, for example, and teaching—these are proper for those whose social position they become.

Finally, besides the professions, Cicero regards the occupations of wholesale merchant (particularly the importer), by whom no misrepresentation is practiced, and of the gentleman farmer (so strong in Roman tradition), as worthy of members of the aristocracy.

Two things become immediately clear. First, "liberal" was not an *internal* quality of learning, but rather *external* to it—the schooling proper for the free citizen. Second, the criterion for the selection of subject matter for the free citizen derived from the cultural values of the society in question. It is for this reason that Cicero, combining the influence of Greek learning and Roman practicality, spoke not only of a *liberal education,* but also of a *liberal occupation.*

II

So long as higher education was limited to privileged social classes, there existed some justification for the continued use of the term "liberal." In the Middle Ages, the Roman ideal continued to prevail in a general way. Thus, at least some of the Seven Liberal Arts, such as astronomy and music, were pursued for practical Church needs as well. In the universities, the faculties of medicine and law were parallel to those of theology and the arts. Beginning with the Renaissance in Italy, the idea of a gentleman cultured in nonprofessional fields began to develop, and it grew as a social phenomenon in Western civilization down to the nineteenth century. Still largely associated with the privileged classes, liberal education at best defined the higher intellectual pursuits of the aristocrat—the modern equivalent of the "free" citizen of antiquity— and at worst was equated with a certain cultural veneer. The common denominator was the familiar characteristic of learning for its own sake. But with the appearance and the steady growth of opportunities for higher education in certain democratic lands, the continued use of the term "liberal" became anomalous. It was thus necessary to transmute its meaning from the original one of an *external* criterion of higher learning to something *inherent* in it. I say *necessary,* because the word had (and still has, I am afraid) a certain magic to it, almost like a present-day advertising slogan with so much public appeal that corporations will pay untold sums for its retention.

Now, since the transfer in meaning was from an external criterion to an internal quality, the field was free for men to do with it as they wished. And what was wished was a meaning that would justify a view on education already held. Thus, for some, liberal was given a metaphorical connotation. What are the *liberal* studies? Those that *liberate* the mind from ignorance and darkness. History, philosophy, mathematics, science, literature—yes! Automotive mechanics, engineering, medi-

cine, journalism, law—no! But does not the latter group enlighten the mind? Furthermore, if the studies in group one are "liberal," why are their applications in group two less "liberal?"

For others, "liberal" came to mean *broad:* a college curriculum is liberal if it is all-inclusive. And yet the all-inclusive is also *exclusive,* strangely enough, for again practical and professional studies are outside the charmed circle. Also, who is not familiar with the struggle for a larger slice of the melon among members of a college curriculum council, all of whom subscribe to this view of *liberal?* Furthermore, how does breadth justify depth? After the basic courses in English and American literatures, why additional work on Browning and Whitman instead of, say, world literature in translation? After the basic courses in Western history, why the Reconstruction period or Europe from 1914 instead of the histories of Latin America, the Far East, and Africa? I do not wish to convey any criticism of existing curricular patterns, but rather to ask those who interpret liberal as broad how they justify specialization in college, which they surely would not do without.

For still others, the essence of "liberal" is *life-enriching* or *edifying.* If you take the professional activities away from the lawyer, the doctor, the playwright, and the engineer, what will be left? If certain intellectual and artistic accomplishments are there to ennoble, enrich, and edify their lives, then they have been liberally as well as professionally educated. Certainly a valuable educational desideratum, this. But let us analyze it somewhat. Assume four capable college students who have already decided upon the four careers just indicated, sitting together in classes in political science, chemistry, literature, and mathematics, each taught by an inspiring professor. The substance of each subject offers a segment of liberal education for three of the four students, and a segment in a master plan for a profession for the fourth. Does not, then, the purpose or special interest of the student enter as a factor? To speak of a subject as inherently liberal in the sense of life-enriching will sometimes ignore the factor of narrow professional interest. But perhaps an even stronger criticism of this view is to ask whether it is not possible for two purposes to coexist in the mind of the student. For example, cannot the aspiring physician in the chemistry class appreciate the ultimate nature of matter and its behavior, and at the same time see himself making progress in his preprofessional training? And years later, as a practicing physician, during a period free from healing, can he not be reading of the latest chemical researches on cancer, and ponder the possibilities of further improvement in the health and welfare of mankind? While his leisure pursuits should not be limited to scientific reading, can it be maintained that a professional field is devoid of liberal content, in the sense of life-enriching? In other words, need there be an inconsistency between liberal and professional?

III

I do not wish to enter into an evaluation of current practice in higher education. Certainly, the rapidly expanding fields of learning are imposing tremendous pressures on those charged with the responsibility of drawing up curricula, as well as on the councils of learning deliberating on the problem. But it is important, it seems to me, to call attention to the mischief of a word to which we unwisely cling. To many it is goddesslike, and each devout worshipper claims that it smiles on him only and speaks the true message to him only. Actually, each one is creating his own object of adoration. For to ask, "What is a liberal education?" is to invite a variety of answers, each of which contains two faults—first, it fashions the meaning of "liberal" to fit an already tailored curriculum, and second, far from being a good fit, it is actually a mask that conceals serious flaws or inconsistencies.

For these reasons it would seem desirable to abandon the term. It should cease to be bandied about in educational councils. What is needed is not new words or reinterpretations of old ones, but forthright deliberations. Out of such deliberations there is bound to emerge a set of principles that will yield a pattern of education reflecting a harmonious blending of the traditions of learning, the aspirations of humanity, and the character of modern society.

Not Without Chagrin

"The former . . . the latter" and "not without"
Are phrases that I can get dizzy about.
I go back to find, through all the chatter,
Which is the former and which is the latter.
And for me the statement would have more pith
If "not without" were simply "with."

Eleanor Graham Vance

Edinburg, Texas

Censured Administrations

Investigations by the American Association of University Professors of the administrations of the several institutions listed below show that they are not observing the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure, endorsed by this Association, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Law Schools, the American Library Association (with adaptations for librarians), the American Political Science Association, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the Association for Higher Education of the National Education Association, the Eastern and Western Divisions of the American Philosophical Association, and the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology.

Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean that censure is visited either upon the whole of the institution or upon the faculty, but specifically upon its present administration. The term "administration" includes the administrative officers and the governing board of the institution. This censure does not affect the eligibility of nonmembers for membership in the Association, nor does it affect the individual rights of our members at the institution in question, nor do members of the Association who accept positions on the faculty of an institution whose administration is thus censured forfeit their membership. This list is published for the sole purpose of informing our members, the profession at large, and the public that unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure have been found to prevail at these institutions. Names are placed on or removed from this censured list by vote of the Association's Annual Meeting.

The censured administrations, with dates of censuring, are listed below. Reports were published as indicated by the parenthesized *Bulletin* citations.

West Chester State Teachers College (Pennsylvania) (February, December, 1939 1939 pp. 44–72)	
The Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia (Spring, 1956, p. 75)	April, 1956
North Dakota Agricultural College (Spring, 1956, pp. 130–160)	April, 1956
The Ohio State University (Spring, 1956, pp. 81–83)	April, 1956
Temple University[1] (Spring, 1956, pp. 79–80)	April, 1956
Catawba College (Spring—April, 1957, pp. 196–224)	April, 1957
University of Nevada (Autumn, 1956, pp. 530–562)	April, 1957
Alabama Polytechnic Institute (Spring, 1958, No. 1, pp. 158–169)	April, 1958
Dickinson College (Spring, 1958, No. 1, pp. 137–150)	April, 1958
Livingstone College (Spring, 1958, No. 1, pp. 188–191)	April, 1958
The University of Michigan (Spring, 1958, No. 1, pp. 53–101)	April, 1958
Southwestern Louisiana Institute (Winter, 1956, pp. 718–733)	April, 1958
Texas Technological College (Spring, 1958, No. 1, pp. 170–187)	April, 1958

[1] By action of the Annual Meeting, April, 1958, censure is removed "on condition that, and whenever, the second paragraph in the recent addition to the University's regulations has been revised in a manner that meets the approval of this Association's Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure."

Science and Humanities in Education[1]

By EUGENE RABINOWITCH
University of Illinois

Wide—and loud—discussion of the proper roles to be given in our high school and college education to the scientific and humanistic[2] subjects has been under way since last fall, when Russian prowess in science and technology was demonstrated by the launching of the first two earth satellites. The ensuing campaign for radical changes in our school curricula has two aspects. In one battle, science and the humanities appear as allies in an attempt to reduce the emphasis put by "progressive" education on so-called "life-adjustment" studies, and shift it back to where it rested earlier in America—and still rests in Europe (including Russia!)—namely, on the study of scientific and humanistic subjects, such as mathematics, physics, chemistry, history, geography, languages. The other battle is between the sciences and humanities for allocation of the time and attention left over by the "life-adjustment" studies.

Neither of these two contests, as such, is the main subject of which I should like to talk today. Rather, I should like to emphasize the necessity of *integration* of all three areas of education—"life-adjustment," science, and the humanities, all three of which, I believe, are needed to produce generations of Americans fit to survive and capable of leadership in the scientific age—a new era in history, into which we were rushed headlong with the discovery of atomic energy thirteen years ago.

[1] An address delivered at the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors at Denver, Colorado, April 25, 1958, introducing a panel discussion in which the other participants were Ian Campbell (California Institute of Technology), Fritz Machlup (The Johns Hopkins University), and Glenn R. Morrow (University of Pennsylvania). The quotations in this paper are from: Sir Eric Ashby, "Technological Humanism," *Impact* 9 (1958), 45; George Boas, "The Problem of the Humanities," *Journal of General Education* 10 (1957), 205; Joseph Gallant, "Literature, Science, and the Manpower Crisis," *Science* 125 (1957), 787; Reinhold Niebuhr, "A Predicament We Share with Russia," *New Leader*, 41 (1958), No. 16, 10; Derek J. Price, "The Scientific Humanities—an Urgent Problem," Second American Humanities Seminar, June 29, 1957.

[2] *Editor's Note.* In this paper, Dr. Rabinowitch uses the term *humanities* broadly, to include all the "scholarly" disciplines outside the natural sciences, engineering, and mathematics.

"Life-Adjustment" in the Atomic Age

The idea that education should provide not merely familiarity with the subject matter of science and the humanities—biology, physics, chemistry, mathematics, history, literature, etc.—but also produce useful members of a free society is a valuable contribution of American thought to modern educational theory, and should by no means be discarded because we have become frightened by the success of Soviet education in producing large numbers of competent scientists and engineers. It has justly been pointed out, in defense of education for citizenship, that intensive study of science and the humanities did not prevent German youth from following in droves the ascientific ideology and the inhumane policies of an Adolph Hitler. Upon leaving the *gymnasia*, with their rigid time-filling curricula in mathematics, history, science, and languages, German youth found themselves helpless and bewildered in facing the realities of life; the unaccustomed democratic forms of political and social life seemed to them to provide no solutions for the problems posed by the loss of the first World War, and later by a world-wide economic crisis and unemployment. Rationality and political sense, which should have been acquired from the study of science and history, appeared of no use in dealing with these harsh facts of life.

Whatever may be wrong with the present "life-adjustment" education in America, the fault is not in its aim. It is not that the school has no responsibility for producing men and women able to live responsibly and happily in a free society, but that the kind of society to which our schools have been trying to adjust our children is not the society which they will actually face. The society which our education presupposes is gone with the wind. As the genteel society of the aristocratic South was blown away by the storm of the Civil War, so our present supposedly stable and permanently prosperous American society is being torn to pieces by the gale of a world-wide triple revolution—social, racial, and scientific.

Despite the violent concussions of two World Wars and of the Great Depression, the preceding generation of Americans lived under essentially constant or only slowly changing conditions. Since the reforms of the New Deal, the aim of our society—which at times seemed close at hand—has become idealized in the "Great American Dream"—the dream of a permanently and universally prosperous nation, slowly but steadily growing in wealth, in fairness to all its members, and in equitable distribution of the superabundant products of a highly productive industry and agriculture. The remaining evils of poverty and racial discrimination seemed destined to slow disappearance. This was to be an example of a successful society for all the world to admire and imitate. Our

unique economic power and wealth were to permit us to assist occasionally in straightening out the tangled affairs of the rest of the world, and help to rehabilitate the victims of hunger and disease in less fortunate countries. (In one, more recent, version, our superior military might was to keep a *pax Americana* in the world.) Our boys and girls had to be educated to fit into this fundamentally sound and stable society. We were on a high plateau, not at the beginning of an arduous climb. We needed no crusaders, no fighters, no great dissenters. What we needed were good community and family men, conscious of their responsibility in local and national affairs—but also of their natural right to security and happiness; men willing to help in removing the remaining minor evils of our society—but essentially satisfied with it.

If this dream did not run directly into conflict with reality, much could be said in favor of our present system of education. One could have argued that in order to sustain, and gradually improve, the American society, it is not important that schools should graduate large numbers of restless intellectuals, dissatisfied with the existing state of affairs, or even a large number of scientists and engineers who could rapidly advance our technology. Schools were not there to stimulate the growth of exceptional minds, to produce great reformers and great scientists; but, rather, to spread widely the moderate amounts of knowledge that prepare people for living a satisfied and useful life, working effectively within the existing framework of economic and social relations, and enjoying the leisure which technical progress is placing at their disposal.

Unfortunately, it was not fated that parents who had caught a glimpse of this enviable state should bequeath it to their children. Instead, the world, and an America inextricably involved in it, has entered an era of instability, of breath-taking changes, of terrifying dangers and blinding promises—a world about which only one thing can be said for certain: that it will look different ten years from now from what it looks today, and different twenty years from now from what it will look in ten years. For any nation, even the most powerful one, to hope that it can quietly enjoy political stability and economic prosperity in the midst of the vast turmoil which now engulfs the earth would be a dangerous delusion. We are educating a generation whose main aim in life will be security, in an age which is, and will remain, abundant in everything but security. In the words of Reinhold Niebuhr, we will have "to live for decades in a continuation of responsibility, anxiety, tension, and frustration, an experience our young nation has never before faced."

Several violent developments have contributed to make our time perhaps the most dynamic era mankind has known. First, there is the great *social* upheaval of our time, which began with the Russian revolution forty years ago—rebellion against the old titled and moneyed ruling

classes (and, as Djilas has emphasized, the growth of new ones). Then there are the even greater *racial* upheavals, which have been slowly gathering speed since the beginning of the century, when Japan first emerged as a world power by defeating a great European power, Russia, but which the nations of the West have immensely accelerated by their two internecine World Wars. Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, there is the great *scientific* revolution which began a century or two ago, but has been tremendously accelerated in the last twenty-five years. This revolution has provided man, for the first time, with quantitative and qualitative understanding of his status on earth, and also with the means of changing this status beyond recognition—either by endangering the very viability of the human race through the spread of radioactivity in a nuclear war, or by assuring slow but certain progress towards world-wide prosperity in a clearly foreseeable future.

In the midst of this violently changing world, we need more than ever that our sons and daughters receive an education that will make them fit to face life, to encounter its realities with understanding and hope, to make them willing and capable of bearing the hardships which may be needed to fashion a brighter future for the world, and to steer mankind away from the path of destruction upon which it is now launched. This reality is not the one to which progressive education has been addressing itself in the past years, and to which it still tries to cling. We need not abandon "education for life"—but we desperately need to adjust it to rapidly changing ways of life. The next generation of Americans must be capable of taking active part in the creation of new political, social, economic, and technological forms of human existence, and not merely of fitting more or less passively into the existing ones. They must combine an abiding faith in the basic values of our society—freedom, equality, justice—with imagination, refusing to regard the existing relations, the accepted rules and the prevailing habits of American (and international) life as permanent and justified, just because they were born into them. The ship of humanity is passing through a violent storm on an uncharted sea. Education for life must be an education in how to stay on deck, and steer the ship through narrow channels between threatening rocks into a safe harbor—not how to ride out the storm in a comfortable stateroom behind battened hatches.

It is not easy for our youth, growing up in the midst of an economy of abundance, in an essentially successful society, to recognize the need for struggle, hardship, and privation in striving for a better future. The Russian or Asian youth grow up amidst poverty and squalor, and for them, the dream of a better future for their own people and for the world has a direct, irresistible appeal. They are taught that the key to this better future lies in science; and the faith in this future, and the

exultation of contributing to its realization, have more to do with the enthusiasm of Russian youth for science (and with the recent precipitous growth of science and technology in Russia) than the carrot of material compensation or the stick of government dictation. If we want to instill a similiar devotion to science in our own youth, we, too, have to offer them more than the inducement of higher salaries, or appeals to the necessities of military defense. We have to make our youth aware of the state of the whole world and the wants of mankind as a whole—of the precariousness of our exclusive national prosperity and security in the midst of a largely miserable and restless world; and arouse in our youth enthusiasm for science as a force which can help us to emerge from this dangerous predicament. This is what "education for life" and "education for citizenship" must mean in our age—education to face the life of mankind as a whole, and to accept the responsibilities of a citizen of the world.

Science for the Non-Scientist

The social and political revolution of our time could have occurred —and probably would have occurred—even if scientific progress had not experienced the fantastic acceleration we have witnessed since the explosion of the first two atom bombs in Japan; but, as it happened, the technological revolution, superimposed over these social and political changes, has given them an entirely new significance and urgency. Americans would have looked with equanimity, if not with sympathy, on the destruction of European colonial empires, and the emergence in Asia and Africa of national states in place of long-stagnant feudal societies. Contrary to the belief of communist theoreticians—for whom the implacable hatred of capitalism for the growing socialist society is an article of dialectic faith—Americans could—and probably would—have watched, without much apprehension, even the unprecedented struggle to impose a new form of social organization on nearly one third of humanity by indoctrination and terror. What makes us deeply concerned is that the violent conflicts which such drastic political, racial, and social changes inevitably generate are now a threat to humanity as a whole, because of the mastery which the several powers, old and new, possess (and others will soon possess) over the forces of the fissioned and the fusioned nucleus. These are forces millions of times stronger than all that had been at the disposal of mankind prior to 1945. Because of this, we need, for our own survival and that of mankind as a whole, an open-minded leadership—men who will not only understand the great national and social movements and revolutionary ideas now abroad in the world, but also appreciate the impact of new science and technology on human affairs. They will need to be able to project the effect of these new forces on the fate of nations into the future, since the unique thing about science

and technology is that they are dynamic phenomena, developing at a rate which leaves far behind the much more slowly evolving—or stagnant—forms of political, economic, and social life. Building the future on the basis of today's science and today's technology would be even more foolish than building it on the basis of today's political and social relations.

In a free society—if it is to remain free—the requirements of leadership are also those of citizenship. A free country cannot take decisive political steps unless their meaning is understood and their necessity comprehended by the citizenry. It is the task of education to make this understanding possible for the generations to come.

Practically every major political decision of our time requires taking into account scientific facts and technological possibilities. In the words of Sir Eric Ashby:

> Even members of the House of Lords find themselves called upon to make decisions about radioactive fall-out, overheating during supersonic flight, and the strontium content of bones.

At the present time, in America, the incorporation of scientific points of view into the making of political decisions is done by a highly unsatisfactory, haphazard method. Political leaders, who have a poor—if any—understanding of science, and little familiarity with technology, receive, more often than not behind closed doors, advice from a few chosen scientific and technological experts. They have no competence to properly evaluate this advice, particularly if it comes not in the familiar terms of yes-or-no, true-or-false statements, but, in conformity with the nature of scientific knowledge and inference, in terms of possibilities and probabilities. (Often, to make their advice understandable, scientists feel that they have to express it—against their better judgment—in the simple black-or-white, do-or-don't form.) The expert opinion is then tossed into the big kettle in which the political brew is being cooked from the usual major ingredients: national interests and idiosyncracies, economic desires of various social groups, and party-political considerations. Scientific and technological arguments, however incontrovertible they may be, are thus diluted, and often altogether lost in policy determinations. We may not go as far in overruling them as did Stalin when he endorsed Lysenko's pseudo-genetics by the syllogism: communism needs rapid transformation of the species of plants and animals; genetics says this is impossible; *ergo,* genetics must be wrong. Our political leaders do not flout the advice of science so brazenly; but they do often ignore it, or pick out, among dissenting scientific opinions, the ones which fit best their political plans, and not the ones which carry the best scientific support.

If democracy is to be real and not a sham in the coming scientific

age, we shall need a public opinion, and a political leadership, able to exercise sound judgment in situations involving scientific or technical facts. This will not require an extensive study of science by all citizens (or even by those intending to seek public offices), but merely a general education producing men and women capable of making a *proper choice* of advisers, according to their scientific competence, and not their political conformity; men prepared to ask *proper questions* of these experts, and capable of *understanding and evaluating their answers*—in the same way most legislative and political leaders now are capable of evaluating the advice of legal or economic experts. This is not as difficult as many seem to believe. The arguments of science are, in fact, often simpler and closer to common sense than are those of lawyers or economists.

Not that politics should or could become a science in any foreseeable future. There will be plenty of scope left for imagination and political instinct, even in a world where scientific evaluation of facts and possibilities of a political situation will be accepted with all the respect it deserves; but politics as art will begin on a much higher level of solid understanding than it does now.

Of course, we *do* need more and better science teaching in our elementary and high schools than we have now; and this teaching should involve less attention to gadgets and more attention to fundamental facts and concepts—less play and more work. Otherwise, our future generations will be deprived of an understanding of some of the most important things around them; and the selection, from their midst, of the (inevitably small) group who will have the thrill of participating actively in advancing this understanding will become accidental and inadequate. However, what is required is not heaping one scientific course upon another, or stuffing the existing ones with more and more subject matter. Scientific knowledge now snowballs so rapidly that the schools cannot hope to supply students—as they were able to do in the past—with the most important factual content of science, or of any of its major branches, as part of general education. What is needed, instead, is a careful selection of material from certain key areas of science, suitable for the demonstration of the methods by which science approaches and explores nature, of the ways in which it arrives at its general concepts; of the types of questions it asks and the types of answers it receives, and of the generalizations and mathematical laws and theories it derives from these answers; so that, on leaving school, students will comprehend the potentialities as well as the limitations of the experimental method, and so that the understanding of the practical utility, heuristic importance, esthetic beauty and philosophic value of general scientific concepts and mathematical laws will be a part of their general intellectual endowment. Science education on the high school level should leave open to every intelligent student

the option of entering, if he should so desire (or if life should require it of him), a field of science, not as a bewildered and helpless stranger, but as a traveller who knows how to find his bearings in an unfamiliar country. To quote Derek Price:

> In classical Greece, when the great growing-tip of civilization was the new concept of Democracy, there were two classes of people: those who were actively involved in this movement and those who were not. The participants were those holding public office—the others, disinclined to such office by nature or nurture, were called *idiotes*. The word proved useful and its meaning was extended from those ignorant of politics to those ignorant of other sections of civilized life—they were *idiots*. . . . Now, without implying that Democracy is one iota less important today, and without over-glorifying Science, I should like to suggest that Science has largely replaced Democracy at the growing-tip of civilization. . . . At the same time that our civilization has become so sensitive to the benefits and woes engendered by science, we have bred amongst us a new class of idiots—a class of those bereft of office, participation, or appreciation of this force which is driving humanity.

The last sentence leads to the most important plea I would like to bring forth: the necessity to provide future generations not only with general understanding of science as such, but, most of all, with the capacity to appreciate those aspects of science which affect the future of man—the impact of science on public affairs, on the fate of our own nation and of mankind as a whole. This means that science should be taught not as a separate body of technical facts, or an autonomous system of ideas, but in relation to other disciplines that traditionally mould the attitude of growing generations towards the society and the world they will have to live in: history, political science, sociology—even religion (although in America, the latter is kept strictly outside the sphere of public education).

This integration of scientific education into the "classic," humanistic studies has two aspects. In the first place, science should be taught with emphasis on the consequences of scientific progress for the general affairs of mankind; on the transformations which the great discoveries of science —we have only to think of evolution, or relativity, or atomic energy— have produced in man's general outlook and position in the world; on the social and ethical problems created, for the scientists and for society, by man's increasing mastery over nature and its forces.

The other—and to my mind more important and more neglected— aspect of the integration of science into the general education of the citizen, is the reverse of the first: the incorporation of the results and attitudes of science into the teaching of humanistic disciplines (and, if churches would be willing to listen, also that of religion!). The teaching of the humanities—in particular, of law, government, and political science

(to a lesser degree, also of economics)—is traditionally static; it takes the existing state of affairs in the world for granted, the nature and capacities of man as constant. True, it is willing to consider the historical development of laws and institutions, but only to the extent it explains the present state of affairs; to justify what there is, not to appreciate its transient nature, or try to predict how it will—or should—change. The present is shown as the culmination of the past, not as a fleeting moment in the increasingly steep climb of mankind towards its future.

Science, on the other hand, is in such rapid development that it has acquired an essentially dynamic outlook. It looks at its facts, concepts, and laws as a temporary and rapidly changeable codex, reflecting the momentary state of affairs. (It was not so in the middle of the nineteenth century, when science offered the outside picture of an almost finished, complete, and immovable edifice, based on solid foundations of Newtonian mechanics.) With the increasing impact of science on all aspects of human existence, the humanities need to share at least some of this dynamism, this anticipation of change and readiness to consider it with an open mind.

Science places man in a vast perspective of space and time, and this relation needs to be reflected in man's attitude towards himself, in his concept of his status and his importance in the universe. This does not destroy the legitimacy of a man-centered philosophy, or a religion postulating man's importance in God's scheme of things; but it places both in a new light. It teaches man a new kind of humility.

The scientific approach to the world around us is exploratory, tentative, relativistic, quantitative; it constructs temporary working hypotheses and discards them; it expresses its conclusions in terms of relative probabilities, not of absolute certainties. The humanities, on the other hand, are accustomed—in particular in the study of law, government, and social and political sciences—to qualitative arguments and to absolute concepts. In the words of George Boas:

> Humanities have remained, on the whole, slave to what their practitioners believe are the universal and eternal values.

In my presence, a world-renowned lawyer argued that blood tests are inadmissable as evidence in paternity cases because they carry a definite, even if small, probability of error (due to mutations); court verdicts, he said, cannot be based on "probability," but only on "certainty" of the judge's or the jury's conviction—which, in his opinion, can be derived, in paternity cases, from the testimony of witnesses or the impression left by the plaintiff!

Mankind will need more of the open-minded, tentative, statistical, relativistic approach to many supposedly absolute truths or values in the

life of individuals or society, if it is to survive and prosper in the scientific age. Science has shown the way with the relativization of such former absolutes as space and time, matter and energy. Bohr's complementary principle has taught science how to use two, on the first glance, mutually exclusive concepts—the wave and the particle—as two equally valid, parallel, and not contradictory approaches to the same physical reality. He has thus opened the door to an intellectually satisfactory justification for the coexistence of concepts, such as causality and freedom, which have been contending for absolute supremacy in our philosophy of history and human behavior. A quantitative, relativistic, complementary approach—instead of postulation of qualitative, absolute, unique truth—is what modern science calls for in our relation to state and society. To quote Joseph Gallant:

> What is needed is a reorientation in our intellectual outlook and in our literary and artistic output, accompanied by a reorientation in the teaching of arts and of the humanities, to gear them to a scientific outlook.

Humanities for the Scientist

The need of better science understanding by the citizen who does not make science his vocation (or avocation) is paralleled by the requirement that scientists should have more education in the broad field of humanities. The scientist is often represented as a narrow specialist with little understanding and interest in literature and art, in history and social problems, and utterly naive and gullible in his political convictions and actions. This is the standard picture of the scientist, not only in comic strips or television plays, but also in literature, even when the author is as familiar with the scientific *milieu* as Mr. Aldous Huxley should be by his family background. It is easy to point out that this picture is inapplicable to many scientists—in fact, to a large majority of them; that many—particularly the really outstanding ones—are very widely read; that the most abstract of them—the theoretical physicists—are, as a rule, highly musical (Planck invented a new musical instrument; Born, Heisenberg, Teller are accomplished pianists; and Einstein's violin is a familiar attribute). Even in the field of politics, scientists are not as naive as they are often supposed to be. When many of them propose radical solutions for the problems of our time, it is not because they are unfamiliar with the real state of affairs in the world and do not appreciate the difficulties of overcoming the traditional, ingrained prejudices and irrational passions which largely determine the behavior of men and nations, and of applying rational methods to the solution of human problems. They are well aware of all these obstacles; but they are even more acutely aware of the consequences of *not* trying to overcome them—a necessity which many nonscientists simply refuse to face.

On the other hand, it is true that, with growing specialization and a rapid increase in the number of scientists, science ceases to be the occupation of a few exceptional minds, many of whom naturally tend to encompass, together with their concern—or even passion—for scientific knowledge, also the enjoyment of art and literature, and compassionate understanding of the social and political problems of humanity. Instead, we are now developing thousands of scientists from average, or slightly better than average, students. These young men and women are under pressure to concentrate their attention on technical studies to keep up with the hard requirements of professional success in their chosen field. Instead of the purely intellectual satisfaction which has been the main lure of science in the past, we are rewarding these large cohorts of young scientists with attractive salaries and (at least in future prospect) with social prestige and influence. Our security and loyalty policies encourage them to stifle their political interests. Under these conditions, there is a real danger of creating a new breed of scientist—technicians, with minds narrowly developed in a single area, satisfied with professional success and without broader intellectual interests. The need is real to inject into the educational curriculum of this new generation of scientists topics of general humanistic interest, so as to prevent their one-sided development, and to make them into harmoniously developed individuals, capable of appreciating man's achievements in fields other than science and engineering, and aware of the historical developments and social problems of the society in which they live.

Attempts to enrich in this way the training of scientists and engineers have been under way, in recent years, in our major engineering schools—Massachusetts and California Institutes of Technology. With the return of high schools to more intensive education in basic subjects, such humanistic studies on the college level will become more productive. We can hope that future American scientists and engineers will not only have taken college courses in literature, art, philosophy, and sociology, but will have learned in high school how to express themselves in clear and grammatically correct English, with adequate vocabulary, and using other punctuation marks in addition to full stops; that they will have an idea of the location of different countries on the map, and the general outline of their history.

This broadening of the education of scientists is, however, not the aspect of the problem which I would like to emphasize today. Rather, I am concerned with the teaching of science itself as a humanistic subject, as I was concerned above with the incorporation of the facts, concepts, and methods of science in the teaching of the humanities. I have argued above that in the scientific age no man will be able to call himself properly educated in history or the social sciences, or fit to act in human affairs

and the development of national policies, if he has no understanding of the general viewpoints and methods of scientific thought; if he has not incorporated into his approach to human existence, as well as to national and international relations (and even into his relation to higher moral forces of the universe), the characteristics of open-mindedness and tolerance, the principles of relativity and complementarity, which modern science has evolved, and which have made it so successful in its dealings with the world around us. In the same way, science cannot remain an activity unrelated to the humanistic principles and values which mankind has evolved in its history. Scientists should be able to see science as part of a broad human striving for the achievement of a better and more perfect state of man. It is not enough to teach the scientist some philosophy, some history, and some sociology, or awaken his interest in art. He has to learn to integrate science with the humanities, and not to place the two mechanically one beside the other.

I can do no better than to quote here from Sir Eric Ashby, the scientist-chancellor of the University of Belfast:

> Ninety years ago, when Thomas Henry Huxley was giving evidence before a Select Committee on Scientific Instruction, he poured scorn on the universities because they made literature and grammar the basis of education and (as he put it) "they actually plume themselves upon their liberality when they stick a few bits of science on the outside of the fabric." It will not do for us, ninety years later, to reverse the process and to plume ourselves upon our liberality when we stick a few bits of the humanities on the outside of the fabric of higher technology. That would not achieve our purpose; it would only generate in students a contempt for the humanities, analogous to the contempt which public schoolboys in the 1860's had for science. It is no good trifling with this problem. We must cut the path to a liberal education through a man's specialism, not by by-passing it for an hour or two a week.
>
> It should be our business in higher technical education to persuade students that they cannot practice technology without continually reflecting upon its social implications, and that some understanding of the humanities is essential to this reflection. For a metallurgist to take a course in general history in order to acquire a little culture is an innocent but not necessarily a very profitable amusement. But if the metallurgist studies the social and economic history of the Industrial Revolution; if he learns how the making of iron followed the forests across Europe until coal replaced charcoal; if he realizes how mining and the building of railways and canals stimulated the study of geology, and how this in turn brought men face to face with the evidence for organic evolution; if he considers the effect which the introduction of electric power has had on the distribution and layout of factories, and the effect which aluminum alloys have already had (through world transport) on the conduct of diplomacy: then history becomes integrated with metallurgy; his humanism becomes a relevant part of his day-to-day thinking. . . .

Later, Ashby quotes Samuel Alexander:

"Liberality in education is a spirit of pursuit, not a choice of subject." If technologists are to enter fully into their responsibilities in the world of tomorrow, they have to adapt themselves not only to novel technologies: they must also be able to adapt themselves to the social consequences of the novel technologies. Their prospects of adaptation certainly depend in part on the spirit with which they pursue technology as undergraduates. To pursue technology in a spirit of liberality, they need not only a thorough training in the theory and practice of technology (they get that already); they need also an understanding of men and communities such as is acquired through literature and history and the social sciences. . . .

All industrial peoples have to solve a great problem in human ecology, namely how to adapt themselves, through the second channel of inheritance,[1] to the social climate which is being created by modern technology. Technologists have a special responsibility to solve this problem for themselves and to reflect on its implications for their fellow citizens. I am persuaded that the solution for technologists lies through the inheritance of education they receive, and I am persuaded that the appropriate education for higher technology should be one which does for contemporary civilization what our traditional classical education has so successfully done for the civilizations of Greece and Rome.

George Boas recently said about scientists and technologists called in as experts to assist in policy decisions:

Since I am neither a scientist nor an engineer, I do not know what takes place in their offices when they are in conference, and hence have no idea whether they ever think of the humanistic consequences of their plans or not. But I judge from talking to those whom I know that they conceive of their problems as cut off from all such subjects. This was exactly the reflection of the Nazi war criminals when shown in films the results of their orders. It is this technique of chopping up problems into specialties which has created the problems of the humanities. If one thinks of these studies as meditations on the philosophic importance of facts, then the chopping is clearly absurd. By facts I mean, of course, descriptions of the universe as given us by the sciences, whether these sciences be physics and chemistry or biology and psychology. And by meditations I mean wondering about such problems as how men can achieve their ideals if the universe is as described by the sciences. . . .

In 1944, with the approach of the atomic bomb development to its successful culmination at Alamagordo, a stirring of responsibility took place in the minds of the scientists associated with this development. Some of them petitioned the President not to use the bombs in Japan, for moral reasons; others wrote memoranda to the government in which the same conclusion was drawn by analyzing the probable influence of atomic energy on the political and strategic developments of the post-war era. These scientists anticipated the rapid development of the atomic

[1] By this term, Ashby means the transmission of accumulated learning, which in human species supplements the biological transmission of heritable traits.

arms race, the creation of "super bombs" a thousand times more powerful than the bombs used in Japan, and the ultimate domination of the whole international situation by the threat of nuclear war. They argued that the discovery of atomic energy should become the signal for the beginning of a "new deal" in world history—for a resolute break with the age-old tradition of wars as legitimate means of solving international conflicts. A new age of world community and world law must be inaugurated, not out of "unrealistic" idealism, but out of the intelligent interest of all nations in self-preservation. Moral revulsion against the indiscriminate mass murder inevitable in the use of atomic weapons merged in this way with the conclusions derived from objective extrapolation of traditional, prescientific history into the atomic age.

For a while, after the secret of the existence of the atom bomb had been revealed by the holocausts of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it seemed that the realization of the from-now-on inescapable involvement of scientific activity in the affairs of mankind, and the consequent responsibility of scientists for the future of man, was spreading among the scientific community. Large numbers of scientists took part in the campaign for the civilian control of atomic energy in the United States, and for the international control of atomic weapons through the United Nations. However, when the first aim was achieved, and the second revealed itself as elusive, this interest subsided, and it soon became clear that the whole movement had been carried forward by only a small number of dedicated individuals.

As time passed, and the impact of the first atomic explosions wore off, as the requirements of professional life became more pressing, and the lure of rewards of success in science stronger, the tide ebbed. Occasionally, a flare-up occurred, such as the recent declaration of seventeen German physicists against the atomic armament of Germany, or Dr. Pauling's petition to the United Nations against the continuation of nuclear bomb tests, signed by over 2000 American scientists. However, both these actions were in the nature of protests, rather than of constructive contributions to the resolution of the tragic involvement of science in the fate of a divided humanity. One could sign, and then go back to complete absorption in one's scientific work—and this is what the majority of signers did.

Twelve years after the start of the movement of "atomic scientists," the majority of Western scientists have only a vague feeling of their new collective responsibility to mankind, and only a few among them are willing to give a substantial fraction of their thought, of their time, and of their energy, to attempts to discharge it.

This is not enough. Scientific education in the future should have as its aim not only to produce well-trained, competent scientists, but also

to instill in their minds a concern with the implications of science for human affairs, and a feeling of their coresponsibility, as scientists, for the fate of mankind in the scientific age.

It has sometimes been suggested that the teaching of science in historical perspective would provide an essential contribution to an understanding of the involvement of science in the general progress of mankind. (Eric Ashby suggested this in the above-quoted passage.) This is true—but only to some extent; to the same extent to which the teaching of history of science as part of the general history course could assist nonscientists in the realization of the essential role science has played in the progress of human society. In both cases, much more than the knowledge of historical developments is needed. In high-school teaching, the ethical and moral aspects of science, the relation of scientific truth to the general system of human values, and the responsibility of science and scientists for the future of society, must be impressed on students. On the college level, scientific education should build up from these foundations, and produce scientists who are citizens in the full sense of the word, able and willing to accept, not only the general duties free society imposes on all citizens, but also the special responsibilities placed on them through the decisive participation of science in the present and future history of mankind—in fact, in the determination whether this history will continue at all.

* * *

I did not touch in this speech on the contributions of sciences (or humanities) to the intellectual enjoyment and spiritual achievement of man as an individual, but only on their contributions to the improvement of human society. This is not because I deny that the highest reward of all education is the capacity it can bestow—or at least enhance—to commune with great spirits, to share great ideas, to partake of the joys of spiritual and artistic accomplishment, and to experience the thrills of penetrating into the inner workings of nature, and the unravelling of the mysteries of life and mind (and—the highest delight of all—to contribute creatively to these achievements, which determine man's spiritual stature in the world). I have abstained from talking about these matters because I am overwhelmingly conscious of the threat which, in our time, the deficiency of human society poses to the very survival of man. It raises the danger of losing all of mankind's past achievements, and destroying man's capacity to add to them or replace them. Man as biological species is in danger of going down the drain of natural history as an unsuccessful experiment—despite all the saints and philosophers, poets, artists, humanitarians, and scientists he has produced. In the face of this danger, I can see no answer in the development of more perfect individuals. The

God of the Bible was willing to preserve Sodom for the sake of ten righteous men, and the Catholic Church sees the purpose of mankind in the production of saints. Being a scientist, I cannot see the fate of mankind in our time as depending on spiritual heights reached by a few individuals. The crisis mankind is facing now will not be resolved by increased capacity of individuals for intellectual achievement or artistic creation, but only by the advancement of human society from its traditional semi-barbaric state to one adequate for survival in the scientific age. It is under this most urgent aspect that I have considered the roles of science and humanities in education—not *sub specie aeternitatis.*

An Academic Stand

Editorial in *The Times* (London), May 17, 1958

Dread of conspiracy, intolerance of dissent, and a certain demagogic prejudice against intellectual pursuits have in recent years combined to produce in the United States a formidable pressure towards clearing all Communists and fellow-travelers out of the universities and colleges. The system of lay administration of many American universities and their peculiar dependence on the good will of their patrons made this pressure hard to resist. That it has now somewhat abated is due to many causes—the discrediting of McCarthyism, the slow but sure vindication of legal freedoms by the Supreme Court, the reassertion of the tradition of toleration, and not least, the well organized and uncompromising stand taken by the academic staffs themselves.

Something both of the threat and of the determined thoroughness with which it has been resisted can be read in the pages of the current issue of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors. Some years ago, the Association issued a clear statement of the principles and procedures by which dismissal of academic staff would be justified. It asserted that Communism and all forms of Marxist interpretation are proper subjects for academic advocacy and rebuttal; that past or present membership of the Communist Party is not in itself sufficient grounds for dismissal, nor is the exercise of the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination afforded by the Fifth Amendment; that in every case it must be shown positively before resorting to dismissal that the person is incompetent, abusing his position as a teacher, or engaged in active conspiracy. Cases, and there have been many, in which these principles were set aside have been investigated by the Association with exemplary thoroughness, and it has been outspoken in its censure of the offending institutions. Its stand deserves the attention of teachers in other free countries.

Membership, Dues, and Related Matters

By BERTRAM H. DAVIS[1]
Washington Office

The Association's deficits in the last two years, and the prospect that its dwindling reserve will soon preclude the possibility of further deficit financing, make it imperative either that the Association's activities be limited to those its income can sustain or that sufficient income be found to sustain its activities. The reserve at the beginning of 1956 was $97,639.97. At the beginning of this year it was $72,293.89, and it seems likely that it will fall to $55,000.00 by the end of the year. To permit it to fall much below this level would be to court insolvency should the Association be faced with an emergency beyond its ability to control.

The first of these alternatives—to curtail activities—is of course not unthinkable; but no retreat would be justified until it was clearly established that resources to support the program were unavailable or that particular activities gave scant promise of significant return.

In determining its activities, the Association has traditionally given priority to its concern for academic freedom and tenure. To a large extent, its work in this area has established the Association's reputation. That there can be no slackening of this work is evidenced by the recent supplementary Spring issue of the *Bulletin*, in which three of the nine reports followed investigations of complaints lodged with the Association only a year ago. Fortunately, the backlog of cases which accumulated during the late 40's and early 50's has at last been disposed of, and the Washington staff and Committee A are now free to consider immediately every complaint brought to their attention and to take whatever action they deem necessary.

The pressing need for improvements has compelled the Association to place a much heavier emphasis on an economic program than it has done in the past. Adequate salaries, improved fringe benefits, and a tax structure which does not discriminate against the academic profession are goals worthy of the Association's best efforts; and while its voice in

[1] In consultation with Professor Leland J. Pritchard (University of Kansas), Chairman of Committee F on Membership and Dues.

some of these matters may be only one among many, it is significantly the voice of those most familiar with the plight of the profession when its needs are inadequately met. Doubtless in the years just ahead the Association will be compelled to allocate an increasing portion of its budget to its activities in this area.

Through staff negotiations and through its committees the Association is currently pursuing a number of other goals. The Committee on College and University Teaching, Research, and Publication is concerned with the development and maintenance of effective college and university instruction; with the conditions of effective research, creative work, and publication by faculty members; and with the recruitment and training of college and university faculties. Another group is studying the complex problems of the ethics of the academic profession. Still another is preparing a report on the numerous anti-subversive acts of state legislatures, which have posed many problems for the profession. Recent negotiations by the Washington office staff have opened promising avenues of cooperation with the regional accrediting agencies, and the Committee on the Accrediting of Colleges and Universities is exploring further ways of cooperating in this all-important work. Increasing faculty participation in college and university government has not obscured the fact that many faculties have little or no voice in determining the policies of their institutions or in selecting department chairmen, deans, and presidents; and the Association is continuing its efforts to achieve its long-term goals in this area.

These activities should return substantial dividends on the investment of time and money they require, and of course they represent only a part of the Association's work. On over 540 campuses, chapters pursue the aims of the Association, adapting their activities constantly to the needs of the local situation. In Washington, staff members must give their attention daily to countless inquiries on professional conduct, salaries, teaching loads, sabbatical leaves, and numerous other subjects; they must hold conferences with teachers, administrators, and officers of other professional associations; supervise reports and coordinate committee activity; communicate with members, chapters, and regional organizations; encourage the recruitment of members and the establishment of new chapters; and see that the records of some 40,000 members of a highly mobile profession are kept continuously up to date.

In short, the Association is engaged in a large and fruitful enterprise, and if resources can be found to support them it would be folly to recommend any curtailment of the Association's activities. Far better, in fact, would be to expand activities in order to meet the increasingly complex demands of a growing profession. Indeed, a number of Association committees have only recently been organized, and they will require addi-

tional funds as their work progresses. But where can resources be found sufficient to eliminate any future deficits in the Association's budget?

Some Possible Economies

One answer is to attempt a number of economies in the Association's operation. The first of these has already gone into effect with this issue of the *Bulletin*. In the past, non-members have been charged fifty cents a line for notices of availability which now cost the Association approximately eighty cents a line to print. Members have been permitted one notice in each volume-year, not to exceed ten lines, without charge. Under a new policy, non-members are being charged $1.00 a line for these notices and members fifty cents a line.

More significant economies might be effected in one or two of the Association's membership policies. At present, persons whose nominations are published in the Autumn and Winter issues of the *Bulletin* pay no dues for the year in which their nominations are announced. Thus, since some nominations are approved for publication in the Autumn issue as early as mid-May, and those whose nominations are so approved may be immediately accepted as Active members at the discretion of their chapters, the Association in effect extends over seven months membership to a number of persons without any obligation for dues.

Behind the present system, it must be made clear, is the fact that under the Association's Constitution no one can be formally elected to membership in the Association until thirty days after his nomination is published. The purpose of the delay is to give members an opportunity to protest nominations of any persons they consider ineligible, and the result of the delay is that persons whose nominations are published in the Autumn issue of the *Bulletin* enjoy only about two months of formal membership in the year of their nomination and that persons whose nominations are published in the Winter issue are not formally elected to membership until the following year. Under these circumstances it has seemed unjust to expect these persons to pay dues for any part of the year in which their nominations are announced. The fact remains, however, that many of these persons enjoy in effect an extended period of membership, and that all of them receive at least one issue of the *Bulletn* and some of them two. In 1957, approximately 2000 copies of the *Bulletin* were distributed without charge as a result of this policy.

Accordingly, in April, 1958 the Council authorized the charge of one-half year's dues, beginning in 1959, for those who become members of the Association in the last half of the year. Thus it took cognizance of the present system of delayed election and the encumbrances of the nomination system, and it instructed the members of Committee F on Membership and Dues to draw up proposals looking towards the elimina-

tion of the nomination system through a change in the Constitution. Such a change would include discontinuing the practice of publishing nominations.

The Nomination System

It must be admitted that as long as the Association has rules governing the eligibility of members (and few people question that it should have such rules) some system of carefully screening applications must be kept in effect. It must be admitted also that new nominees probably appreciate having their names published in the *Bulletin* and that chapters which have conducted particularly successful membership campaigns are gratified by the recognition of their success implicit in the published lists of nominations. But in 1956 only one nomination out of 3099 published in the *Bulletin* was protested, and in 1957 only one out of 4295 was protested—evidence of the careful attention to the Association's eligibility requirements given by both chapter officers and members of the Association's staff. Is it necessary to set aside 29 pages of the *Bulletin*, as was done in 1956, or 36 pages, as was done in 1957, to invite protests of nominations when each nomination would seem to have about one chance in 4000 of being protested? It may be wondered, moreover, if in 1956 and 1957 nominees and chapter officers (whose membership successes could have been briefly acknowledged in the membership distribution lists of the Spring *Bulletin*) would not willingly have relinquished the pleasures the list affords if they had known that the Association could have saved about $850 by not publishing these lists in 1956 and about $1150 by not publishing them in 1957. Publishing nominations in the Spring, 1958 issue of the *Bulletin* alone cost nearly $600.

There are other difficulties inherent in the nomination system. Ostensibly, when an Active member signs a nomination form as nominator, he is vouching for the academic standing of the nominee, and under a nomination system every person interested in becoming a member should be properly nominated by some present member aware of his qualifications. To insist upon a strict observance of this formality, however, would handicap the Association appreciably in its efforts to maintain and increase its membership. Each year several thousand letters of invitation are mailed from the Washington office to nonmembers on the basis of recommendations submitted by members, and it would be costly and tedious for the Washington office to insist that nominations returned by persons without easy access to the signature of an Active member be sent, for their endorsement, to the persons who had submitted the recommendations. Similarly, to increase its membership, the Washington office frequently sends letters of invitation to the entire faculties of a number of institutions without Association member-

ship, including all newly accredited institutions, but if the Association required the signature of an Active member acquainted with those who accepted such invitations, this important method of increasing membership and ultimately increasing the number of chapters might well have to be abandoned. Under present practice, the General Secretary, in sending his invitation, offers to act as nominator if the signature of another Active member is not readily available. In other words, no one is denied Association membership for want of a nominator.

Replacement of the present system of nomination and election by a system under which membership is achieved through application, with dues for new members assessed on either a yearly or half-yearly basis, should expedite the membership process, increase the Association's income from dues, and eliminate some of the clerical work required by the present system. Had a change of this kind taken effect in 1957, the Association would have added about $3800 to its dues income and saved about $1150 on the cost of the *Bulletin*[1]—a total saving of more than one third of the entire deficit in 1957. In conducting their fall membership campaigns, to be sure, some chapters may have felt an advantage in being able to offer prospective members a brief period of membership before they became obligated for dues. But it is doubtful that many persons really expect this consideration, much as it may be appreciated, or that they would be deterred from joining the Association because they incurred an obligation for dues from the time their membership began.

The System of Dropping Members

Another substantial saving should be possible next year under a recent Council ruling revising the Association's system of dropping members. Under the present system, members are billed in January for the current year's dues, and if they do not formally resign, they are extended membership throughout the year and sent all issues of the *Bulletin*. Those who have not paid by October are billed again at that time. If they have not paid dues by December 31, they are then dropped from the Association's mailing list but are continued as members for still another year. During this second year they are billed for $15.00 in January and, if they still have not paid, for $15.00 in October. On December 31 of the second year, those who have not paid are dropped from membership.

At the end of 1957, 2240 persons were dropped from Association membership for failure to pay 1956 and 1957 dues. In 1956 all these persons received the *Bulletin*—a total of 8960 copies, which cost the Association approximately $2600 to print and mail and for which it

[1] It should be noted that, beginning with the Fall, 1958 issue, the Council has approved the publication of nominations in some less expensive medium than the *Bulletin*. A constitutional change eliminating the nomination system would make even this publication unnecessary.

received no reimbursement. In past years losses of this kind could be partially recovered because former members wishing reinstatement were required to pay dues for the last year in which they received all issues of the *Bulletin*. The present system of reinstatement, however, does not require former members who have been out of the Association at least a year to pay back dues, and thus in the future the Association will be compensated for only a very small part of these losses.

Beginning with 1959, the Association will change to a system whereby members will be expected to pay annual dues before they receive more than one issue of the *Bulletin*. All members will be billed as usual in January, with notice that those who do not remit dues by May 25 will be dropped from the Association's mailing list, but not from membership. Early in May a second notice will be sent to all members who have not already paid. In October a final notice will be sent to all delinquent members, informing them that those who do not remit dues by December 31 will be dropped from membership. In 1960 and thereafter, the same cycle will be repeated. The recent Council ruling also provides that members who do not pay 1958 dues will be dropped from membership on April 30, 1959, instead of on December 31, 1959, when members two years in arrears would, under the present system, be dropped.

One disadvantage of this change is that it will require an already heavily burdened clerical staff to prepare three billings annually instead of the present two. The problems here, however, are not insuperable. A more serious problem is posed by the indeterminable effect such a change will have upon membership. Normally, over two thirds of the Association's dues income is received in Washington within four months of the first billing, and a similar proportion will probably be received under the revised system. But at present some 4000 members have not paid dues by the end of the year, and if under its new system the Association were forced to drop this many members from its rolls, its opportunity to grow in size and influence would be seriously endangered. At present, it should be noted, many of those who fail to pay dues in a given year pay them the next year in answer to one of the two billings for $15.00 dues. After January, 1959, however, no one will be billed whose dues are more than a year in arrears.

The answer to this problem lies in the additional annual billing and in a forthright explanation to members of the reasons for the change. A reasonable membership such as ours may be expected to respond favorably to a change if it promises economy, as a change of this kind does. It is likely that the second billing in May will have to be mailed to about 12,000 Active members, and this billing should quickly elicit dues, as does the present October billing, from approximately 40% of those who have not already paid. Deducting those who remit dues

during August and September (about 1000), it would appear that approximately 6000 Active members might have to be sent the final bill in October. With a notice that failure to meet this obligation by December 31 would result in loss of membership, it is to be hoped that a sizable portion of these persons will pay before the end of the year.

Contributions

Additional funds are being made available to the Association this year through the generosity of members, over 2000 of whom have already found it possible to contribute more than $5000 to further the Association's work. It would seem that in future years this opportunity to contribute should again be offered to members.

An Increase in Membership

All the changes described above should help to increase the Association's income. Yet it may be doubted that their combined effect will either offset the deficits implicit in the Association's present program or make possible the extension of activities desirable in a period when the academic profession is undergoing searching re-examination and almost unprecedented growth. In a budget of more than $250,000, all these savings, however important they may be, are nominal; to meet the Association's needs something more substantial is required. One answer is a sizable increase in membership. Another is a change in dues.

The number of college and university teachers actually eligible for Association membership is not easily estimated, but it is obvious that the Association's membership is considerably less than 50% of that number. Even the most successful chapters rarely number as many as 70% of the faculty in their group, and some chapters number as few as 15 or 20%. At several hundred institutions no faculty member is an Association member. There is, therefore, considerable opportunity for growth. And the Association is growing. In two years the number of chapters has increased from 474 to 542, and the number of institutions with Association members has increased from 1008 to 1064. But with dues at their present level, can the Association grow quickly enough for its income to keep pace with the demands to be placed on it?

Each thousand increase in Active membership means, of course, an increase of $7500 in the Association's income, but even an annual growth of 3000, with its attendant increase in income of over $21,000, might not permit the significant broadening of interests for which the Association must now prepare. By no means all of this income could be allocated for this purpose; some of it would be consumed in the printing and mailing of additional *Bulletins,* and some in unavoidable routine work, requiring additional appointments to the clerical staff. Costs,

particularly of printing, continue to rise. Moreover, whether or not the Association can expect so rapid a growth is open to serious question. It must be remembered that an increase is possible only if new nominations more than offset the losses through deaths, resignations, and lapses —losses which annually total well over 3000. In 1957, in spite of these losses, membership increased about 950, and in 1958 it will probably increase another 2000. Both these increases are traceable to the devoted efforts of members everywhere, particularly chapter officers and membership committees, as well as to the efforts of members of the Washington office staff. No doubt, if the systematic methods employed by many chapters this year and in the past are followed again next year and adopted by numerous other chapters, an increase of 3000 would be feasible in 1959. But no one can predict with certainty that this situation can come about. An increase of 3000 a year for the next ten years is, however, a goal for which the Association must be ready to work.

A Change in Dues

The uncertainty of membership, and the limited savings which the measures described in the foregoing pages will make possible, have prompted the Council to raise the dues of Active members to $8.00, beginning with the calendar year 1959. So nominal an increase, it is hoped, will not in any way impede the Association's membership program. Its purpose is solely to assure a balanced budget in 1959, without resorting to the necessity of abandoning any of the Association's traditional activities or any of its more promising new ones. At the same time, the Council directed the members of Committee F on Membership and Dues to continue their study of the dues problem with a view possibly to recommending a sliding scale of dues, based on either salary or rank.

The most recent dues increase occurred in 1955, when dues for Active membership were raised from $5.00 to $7.50, and the effects of that increase must be studied before any further increase can be recommended. The effect on membership may be estimated from the following tables of resignations and lapses for the years 1954–1957:

Resignations	Lapses
1954—1004	1954—3172
1955—1813	1955—2712
1956—1536	1956—2983
1957—1416	1957—2240

It seems beyond question that many of the additional resignations in 1955 may be accounted for by the increase in dues, which had just gone into effect, and that many of the additional lapses in 1956, when those who first failed to pay dues in 1955 would have been dropped from

membership, may be accounted for in the same way. On the other hand, a loss of not more than 3% in membership resulting from a 50% increase in dues cannot be considered excessive or even large. In view of the fact that the dues income rose from $167,213.29 in 1954 to $226,681.90 in 1955, making possible a great expansion of the Association's program, the wisdom of raising dues in 1955 is difficult to question.

The effect of a dues increase beyond that already voted for 1959 can only be guessed at. Even though dues of $8.00 may be less than those of many professional associations,[1] doubtless some members will find them high, and some persons may not seek membership because of them. With the Association's strength closely, although not directly, proportionate to the size of its membership, one must be reluctant to propose any change in dues which would encourage additional resignations or place additional barriers in the way of recruiting new members. To be sure, a number of members have proposed an increase in dues to $10.00 and some have proposed an increase to $15.00. The latter figure, at this time, almost certainly would risk a loss in membership which would preclude any substantial increase in revenue; the former should increase revenue substantially but might also result in a loss of members.

It is important, therefore, to find a dues structure which will assure the Association's continuing growth and provide sufficient income for the Association to broaden its program to suit the needs of an expanding academic profession. A further nominal increase—for example, to $8.50—might accomplish both these purposes. Such an increase would probably not compel members to resign in any great number, nor would it place an insurmountable barrier in the way of those who wished to join the Association. In all likelihood, it would increase the annual income by an additional $15,000, which, with the increased income from membership growth, should make it possible for the Association to underwrite the broad program it has before it.

As has been mentioned, another system of assessing dues is under consideration by Committee F and the Council, and is here presented for the consideration of the membership as a whole. This is the graduated scale of dues, with each member's dues determined either by his rank or by his salary for the academic year. The chief advantage of a scale based upon salary is that it affords some relief for those on whom the payment of dues places the greatest burden; it has the further advantage that it would probably remain in effect longer than a flat increase, since

[1] American Bar Association—$4.00–25.00; American Chemical Society—$12.00; American Economic Association—$6.00; American Historical Association—$7.50; American Library Association—$6.00–$20.00; American Mathematical Society—$14.00; American Medical Association—$25.00; American Political Science Association—$10.00; American Psychological Association—$20.00–$25.00; American Sociological Society—$10.00; Modern Language Association—$10.00.

it would permit the Association's income to grow in the coming years in about the same proportion as academic salaries.

With too many steps on a graduated scale, the difficulty of administering the scale might easily outweigh its advantages. A reasonable scale might contain three steps, perhaps of $7.50, $10.00, and $12.50, with members having the right to determine their own dues by finding the place on the scale at which their salaries fall.

Conclusion

This consideration of the dues problem has been undertaken at this time in order that members may have an opportunity to make their wishes known before further action is taken. Quite possibly there are other factors which should have been taken into account. Most certainly the dues changes which have been considered do not exhaust the possibilities, and there may be compelling reasons to adopt an entirely different plan. While the breadth of the Association's program should attract many new members in the years to come, it may be questioned whether the income to support such a program can be gained solely through additions to the Association's membership. In this it would be gratifying to be proved wrong. In any event, it would seem desirable to delay final action on a further increase until the spring of 1959, by which time it should be possible to predict with some accuracy the expected membership gains for that year.

All interested individuals and groups are therefore invited to study and discuss these matters and to send to the Washington office the results of their deliberations. No one, of course, can be assured that his suggestions will be adopted. He can be assured, however, that many of these matters have not yet been settled and that every suggestion will be given careful consideration by the members of the Association's Committee F on Membership and Dues.

Increase in Dues—1959

At its April meeting, the Council voted to raise the dues of Active members from $7.50 to $8.00, beginning with the calendar year 1959. In taking this step, the Council emphasized that its purpose was solely to enable the Association to balance its budget on the basis of its present program and operations. The Council directed the members of Committee F on Membership and Dues to continue their study of the long range dues and income problem and to submit recommendations to the Council at the November 1958 meeting. For a discussion of the problem of dues, see, in this issue, pages 272–74.

Reply to a Well-known Humorist

Who is of the opinion that the mathematician is a dull fellow—"the only rhythm that he knows—a logarithm"

When man above the beast arose,
A lordlier creature,
With sharpened stones he dealt his blows
To conquer Nature.

Then sharpened wit new weapons wrought
For blows more stunning:
He made him tools of words and thought,
And symbols cunning.

With these he weaves his net to snare
Her deep intention,
Till man and Nature peace declare
With comprehension.

Unblest is he who counts as dross
The sport symbolic;
To whom an x is but a cross,
And y—a colic!

That Nature's self forever chimes
A numbered paean
Is true today as 'twas in times
Pythagorean.

To this your Muse's eyes are shut—
She does not know it.
You are a clever rhymester, but
Alas! no poet.

Florence P. Lewis

Goucher College (Emeritus)

Animadversions on Black and White Horses

The two contributed articles which follow, by Professors Lawrence F. Mansfield and Edwin Moise, were written and submitted independently as replies to Professor Harold C. Hand's "Black Horses Eat More Than White Horses" (*AAUP Bulletin*, Summer, 1957, pp. 266–79). Each was critical of Professor Hand's statistics or his interpretations of statistics. As originally submitted, each article included further comments, critical of certain general positions on education, but both authors graciously consented to the removal of these comments, on the Editor's representation of the undesirability at this time, for reasons of space and other reasons as well, of reopening the controversy between "educationists" and "subject-matter people."

The articles, comments on them by Professor Hand, and countercomments were exchanged back and forth up to the very dead-line for the submission of *Bulletin* copy to the printer. Professor Moise revised his article in the light of Professor Hand's comments, and Professor Hand's reply here published is to the revised article. Professor Mansfield did not revise his article, but wrote a reply to Professor Hand's comments; these comments, and Professor Mansfield's reply, are here published. The Editor, squeezed between the Annual Meeting and the May 1 deadline, could not allow the time for a final statement of differences; if an additional statement—or statements—should seem to be necessary in the interest of justice, an attempt will be made to find room in the Autumn issue.[1]

Each article will be followed by Professor Hand's comments on it; these comments will be followed, in one case, by Professor Mansfield's reply.

Perhaps few readers need to be reminded that Professor Hand's article originated as a reply to an interview with Professor Arthur Bestor, published in *U. S. News and World Report*, November 30, 1956, under the title "We are Less Educated Than 50 Years Ago."

[1] Apologies are due to the two authors for the considerable time that has elapsed since they submitted their articles, and to all concerned (including *Bulletin* readers) for the use of nine-point type. Both facts are explained by exigencies of time and space—the Editor's time, and the *Bulletin's* space.

Black Horses May {Or May Not} Eat More Than White Horses

By LAWRENCE F. MANSFIELD
The Florida State University

Professor Harold C. Hand, in an article in the June, 1957 issue of the *AAUP Bulletin*, attempts to refute an impression, which he believes to be gaining ground, that the public secondary schools have deteriorated in the character of the education they give. He is particularly annoyed with an article which appeared in *U. S. News and World Report* of November 30, 1956, which quotes figures derived from publications of the U. S. Office of Education in an attempt to show that smaller percentages of high-school students take science, mathematics, and foreign language courses now than did so in 1900.

Professor Hand makes five points:

1. The figures quoted by *U. S. News and World Report* are misleading, and give an entirely false impression of the percentage of high-school students taking the courses in question.
2. Since a much larger percentage of Americans now go to high school than went in 1900, "we," meaning Americans as a whole, are better educated now.
3. The figure given by *U. S. News and World Report* concerning the percentage of our high schools which offer no science or mathematics is misleading, since it refers to the number of schools and not the number of students enrolled in those schools.
4. Contrary to the impression created by the *U. S. News* article, school superintendents, principals, and professors of education are not to blame for the shortcomings (whatever they may be) of our high schools in these areas.
5. All the evidence, such as it is, indicates that high-school students are learning more now than they did fifty years ago.

I have no quarrel whatever with point number three. The other points are, I think, highly questionable. I wish particularly to discuss the first and second.

Professor Hand argues that the raw figures quoted by *U. S. News* are misleading because they show only the percentages of all students *in all four years of high school* who were taking the subjects in question *in a single year* (the academic year 1948–49). The figures quoted from *U. S. News and World Report* are as follows:

	1900	*"Now"*
Percentage of high-school students enrolled in:		
Science	84%	54%
Mathematics	86%	55%
Foreign languages	73%	22%

He points out that the magazine did not use figures, although they were readily available from the same source, showing that the enrollment figures for English and history were:

	1900	*1948–49*
English	39%	93%
History	38%	39%

He breaks the mathematics offerings down into the specific courses given in 1948–49 and shows that the figure of 55% was obtained by adding the percentages of the total student population taking each course, as follows:

Elementary Algebra	20%	Plane Geometry	10%
Intermediate Algebra	7%	Solid Geometry	3%
General Mathematics	13%	Trigonometry	2%

He then postulates a hypothetical high school whose enrollment figures conform to the statistical averages for the distribution of high-school students among the four years of high school, as determined by the U. S. Office of Education. The population of this high school he supposes to be 500 in any one year. Then the division of the student body into the four grades would be:

	Number of Pupils	*Percent of pupils in each grade as reported by U. S. Office of Education*
9th grade class	155	31%
10th grade class	135	27%
11th grade class	115	23%
12th grade class	95	19%
Total	500	100%

Twenty per cent of the *total student body* took elementary algebra in 1948–49. That would mean 100 students in our hypothetical school. Since "elementary algebra [is] a 9th grade subject" (according to Professor Hand), this means that 65% of our 9th graders took elementary algebra. "General mathematics is also a 9th grade subject. It is commonly taken by pupils who do not take algebra, but about one-fifth of the pupils who enroll in general mathematics take it in the 10th instead of in the 9th grade." Thirteen per cent of the total student body took general mathematics in 1948–49, or 65 pupils. Four-fifths of these were 9th graders, or 52. The other 13 who took it that year were presumably 10th graders. The conclusion is, therefore, that 152 out of 155 9th graders (98%) had some form of mathematics. The 9th grade class of the following year, if it conforms to the statistical average, would repeat that experience. The sophomore class that same year would be taking general mathematics (13 students) and plane geometry, a 10th grade subject. Ten per cent of the total student body took plane geometry, or 50 students. This represents 37% of the 135 pupils remaining in the sophomore class. The 13 general mathematics students represent another 10%, making a total of 47% of the sophomore class taking some form of mathematics. Applying the same reasoning, he found 30% of the junior class taking intermediate algebra, an 11th grade subject, and somewhere between 16% and 26% of the senior class taking solid geometry and trigonometry. (The percentage would vary depending on whether all or only part of these students took both courses.)

II

Now let us advance this student body one year. Remember that 152 of our 155 9th graders had taken either elementary algebra or general mathe-

matics. As sophomores, they will take either plane geometry (50 students) or general mathematics (13 students). But consider what this means. Of the 155 9th graders we started with, 100 took elementary algebra in their freshman year, 52 took general mathematics in their freshman year, and 13 took general mathematics in their sophomore year. Thus, out of 155 who started in the fall of 1948, 165 had taken elementary algebra or general mathematics by the spring of 1950, in spite of the fact that 20 had dropped out by the spring of 1949!

This might be explained in the following ways:

1. Those who did not take any mathematics the first year might take general mathematics the second year (this would account for 3 students at the most).

2. Some students might take elementary algebra and general mathematics concurrently in their freshman year, thus reducing the number of freshmen who had had some mathematics and leaving more freshmen who had never had any mathematics to take general mathematics in their sophomore year.

3. Some of those who took elementary algebra might take an additional course in general mathematics in their sophomore year.

4. Some of those who took elementary algebra in their freshman year may have failed it and decided to take general mathematics in their sophomore year.

5. Some of those who took general mathematics their first year might repeat it (because of failure).

Of these five possibilities, the first does not help us much, since, at best, it would account for only 3 out of 10 students. The second and third are highly unlikely, since, as Hand says, "it [general mathematics] is commonly taken by pupils who do not take algebra." That leaves us with four and five to bear the burden of explanation. This is highly significant, since it casts doubt on all of Professor Hand's figures. If we assume, as we apparently must, that a sizable percentage of the students taking general mathematics are repeaters, how do we know that the same is not true of elementary algebra? In other words, it is not necessarily true that all 100 of the elementary algebra students are freshmen. Some of them (we do not know how many) may be sophomores, juniors, or even seniors completing a requirement for graduation. But that must cut down the number (and therefore the percentage) of freshmen taking elementary algebra in any one year. Thus, we cannot say that 98% of all high-school students have been exposed to some form of mathematics at some point in their high-school careers. Without additional information, there is no way of telling just what percentage of those who entered had *any* mathematical training; nor is there any way of telling what percentage of those who finally graduated from high school had any mathematics.

Professor Hand has certainly proved that statistics may sometimes be misleading. He has performed a service in correcting the erroneous impression created by the 55% figure, which would seem to the superficial observer (and I confess myself to have been one) to mean that 45% of high-school students never have any contact with mathematics nowadays. He has shown this to be an unjustifiable conclusion. The fact remains, however, that 86% of all pupils in high school in 1900 were taking mathematics. This is a much higher figure than in 1948–49. The difference in the figures can only be explained, as far as I can see, in one of the following ways:

1. The drop-out rate might have been so much higher in 1900 that a much larger percentage of the student body was concentrated in the first year or two.

Since it is a fairly safe assumption that the percentage of the students *in any grade* taking mathematics is highest in the first two years (either in 1900 or today), such a skewed distribution of the school population might pad the 1900 over-all figure in comparison with today's.

2. The repetition rate might have been much higher in 1900. In other words, the same percentage of entering freshmen might have taken mathematics in the two periods, but a much higher flunk rate in 1900 might have made the same students show up in the statistics two or even three times, whereas today they might show up only once.

3. The pupils of 1900 either elected or were required to take more advanced mathematics than was the case in 1948–49. It seems very clear, even after the doubt cast on Professor Hand's figures, that a very large percentage of 9th grade students do take some mathematics. Proportionately more first-year students may have taken mathematics in 1900 than did so in 1948–49, but there would hardly seem to be enough room to explain the great difference in the over-all figures.

Although there may be some validity to the first two explanations, the burden of explanation certainly seems to lie with number three. In other words, it seems fairly clear that people who went to high school in 1900 (and particularly those who graduated from it) had to (or did) take considerably more mathematics than people today. The same reasoning would apply (with some modification) to science and foreign languages. To put the matter another way, the comparison between the 1900 and "Now" percentage figures still is significant, even though it is unwarranted to draw conclusions based on the difference in the absolute size of the figures.

III

Professor Hand is also unhappy about *U. S. News and World Report's* undiscriminating use of the catch-phrase "we are less educated than 50 years ago." If by "we" is meant the people of the United States as a whole, the phrase is misleading, to say the least, since 64% of all people of high-school age were attending public high schools in 1950, compared with 8% in 1900. Obviously, a much larger percentage of the population is getting *some* sort of education now than in 1900. But this is not the real essence of the charge so crudely made by *U. S. News*. The real question is: Has the content of our education been watered down in the process of extending it to more and more people? Professor Hand shows that the percentage of people of high-school age in the U. S. who were enrolled in foreign languages, mathematics, and science in 1950 was much higher than in 1900. The relevant figures are these:

	1900	*1950*[1]
Total public high-school enrollment	519,251	5,399,452
Total population of high school age	6,152,231	8,404,757
Percentage of pupils attending high school who were enrolled in:		
Foreign languages	73%	22%
Mathematics	86%	55%
Science	84%	54%

[1] Professor Hand's figures for percentages enrolled in a given subject are for the academic year 1948–49, as reported in a U. S. Office of Education bulletin entitled *Statistical Summary of Education, 1949–1950*. He does not cite the source of his figures for total enrollment and total population of high-school age, but says they are for the year 1950.

Obviously, 73% of 519,251 is only a much smaller percentage (6%) of 6,152,-231. Following this line of reasoning, Professor Hand comes out with these figures:

	1900	*1950*
Percentage of all youths of high school age living in the USA who were enrolled in:		
Foreign Languages	6%	14%
Mathematics	7%	35%
Science	7%	35%

These figures prove, as Professor Hand says, that "more of our present-day youths are enrolled in one or more courses in science and mathematics than was true in 1900." True. But let us compare the above figures for 1950 with the figures that would have obtained if the percentage of students enrolled in high school that took these subjects had been the same in 1950 as it was in 1900. In other words, apply the 73% for foreign languages to the total public high-school enrollment figure for 1950 of 5,399,452, and then express that as a percentage of the total population of high school age in 1950 of 8,404,757. This method shows the following comparison:

	1950 (*Actual*)	*1950* (*If the same % of high-school students had taken the course as did in 1900*)
Percentage of all youths of high-school age living in the USA who were enrolled in:		
Foreign languages	14%	47%
Mathematics	35%	55%
Science	35%	54%

This comparison (although admitting the inadequacy of the figures) is a rough measure of the extent to which our high-school education has been diluted over the last 50 years. In other words, if we had retained the same curriculum that we had in 1900, while extending our public education system to more of the population, approximately $3^1/_2$ times as many people would now be taking some foreign language, and $1^1/_2$ times as many would have some mathematics and science as actually do. Probably not many people would have wanted to preserve the 1900 curriculum intact. Apparently, English has increased its place in the curriculum and history has about held its own. But English cannot account for all of the time lost from foreign languages, mathematics, and science. What has? Alas, I am sure we can all think of horrible examples.

Comments by Professor Hand

Three major criticisms of my "Black Horses Eat More Than White Horses" are offered by Professor Mansfield. I shall comment on each of these criticisms in turn.

II

The seeming contradiction in regard to my reckoning of the enrollment in general mathematics to which Professor Mansfield calls attention is real only if it is true that the high schools offer but one year of work in this subject. A small number of secondary schools, generally the larger ones, offer a second-level course in general mathematics. This second-year enrollment undoubtedly accounts for most of the 10 out of the 65 pupils in our model for whom the hypotheses offered by Professor Mansfield cannot account. I was derelict in not taking note of this second-level enrollment, and I should have said that general mathematics is "typically" a 9th-grade subject.

This seeming contradiction "casts doubt on all of Professor Hand's figures," Professor Mansfield says. Parenthetically, my reckonings were for the same school year that Professor Bestor utilized in speaking of "now" or "today": namely, 1948–49, but I referred to this year as 1950 because this was the designation employed by the *U. S. News & World Report* in reporting Professor Bestor's 1900 *vs.* "now" comparisons. Two reports have come from the U. S. Office of Education (USOE) which not only give the enrollments in public high-school mathematics and science courses for 1954–55 and 1956–57, but break with past USOE practice in that each of these enrollments is expressed as the per cent of the pupils in the grade where the course is usually offered. Since this is the basis that I employed in my calculations, a comparison of my reckonings for 1948–49 with those reported by the USOE for 1954–55 and 1955–56 may afford some basis for estimating how close to being true my reckonings probably were.

In summarizing its findings regarding enrollments in mathematics, the USOE said: "The number of pupils enrolled in elementary algebra in all schools in 1954 was 64.5 per cent of the number of pupils in the 9th grade; in 1956, 67.0 per cent. [My reckoning for 1948–49 was 65 per cent.] In plane geometry the enrollments were approximately 37 per cent of the 10th grade pupils in 1954 and 42 per cent in 1956. [My calculation for 1948–49, 37 per cent.] The percentage for intermediate algebra increased also: enrollments rose [from 28.5% for 1954] to nearly one-third [32.2%] of the number of 11th grade pupils. [My estimate for 1948–49, 30%.] After adjustments for the usual drop-outs in half-year subjects, it is estimated that the number of pupils enrolled in solid geometry and trigonometry . . . was approximately 12.6 per cent and 15.8 per cent of all 12th grade pupils in the public high schools. [This was a slightly greater figure than that for 1954 in both instances. My estimate for 1948–49 was 16%.]"[1] The USOE also reported that the 1956 enrollment in general mathematics was equal to 43.1 per cent of the pupils in the 9th grade; in 1954, 44.5 per cent.[2] My reckoning for 1948–49 was 65 out of 155 youngsters, or about 42 per cent.

And here are the comparisons in respect to enrollments in science courses —I give first the USOE figure for 1956, then its figure for 1954, and finally my calculation for 1948–49: general science, 67.0%, not reported, 71%; biology, 75.5%, 72.6%, 67%; chemistry, 34.6%, 31.9%, 30%; physics, 24.3%, 23.5%, 28%.[3]

[1] *Offerings and Enrollments in Science and Mathematics in Public High Schools*, 1956, pp. 31, 33.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 31.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

III

The second observation made by Professor Mansfield is that "the comparison between the 1900 and the 'now' percentage figures is significant, even though it is unwarranted to draw conclusions based on the difference in the absolute size of the figures." Just what he means by "significant" is not made clear, but I suspect that he means to imply that the comparison, even when qualified as he suggests, is more than a little unfavorable to the present-day high school.

There are three factual considerations which, when taken together, make this a conclusion of dubious validity. One is that, as Professor Mansfield speculated might be true, the grade-level distribution of high-school pupils was very different in 1900 from what it was in 1950. The second is that a far larger proportion of the total youth population was in high school in 1950 than was true in 1900. And the third is that it is generally only the youths in the upper third of the intelligence distribution who can succeed in and profit from advanced courses in mathematics and science, and that very frequently it is only those from homes in which advanced education is highly valued who are willing to submit themselves to the rigors of these subjects. Now let us look further at each of these three considerations in turn.

The U. S. Office of Education has reported the following grade-level distributions of pupils for as far back as 1920, but gives no such data for 1900 or any other prior date:[1]

Grade	*1950*	*1930*	*1920*
9	31%	35%	40%
10	27%	27%	27%
11	23%	21%	19%
12	19%	17%	14%

If one were to extrapolate the 1930 and 1920 enrollment data to 1900, the resultant figures would be: 9th grade, 50%; 10th, 27%; 11th, 15%; 12th, 8%. I know of but two instances of actual grade-level enrollment reports for 1900 (Dayton and St. Louis). When averaged, these two reports yield the following grade-level enrollment data: 9th grade, 47%; 10th, 30%; 11th, 13%; 12th, 10%. If we accept these known data instead of those derived by extrapolation, it is evident that the 1950 enrollment figure (81%) which would have resulted if all 9th, 10th, and 11th grade pupils had been enrolled in, say, mathematics is but 4 percentage points larger than that (77%) which would have resulted from doing no more than requiring this subject of all 9th and 10th grade pupils in 1900.

Another way of assessing this consideration is to take note of the quite different performances that would be necessary to yield the 86% enrollment figure noted for mathematics in 1900. We have good reason to believe that two years of mathematics was commonly required in that era. If this was indeed the case, only one-half of the 11th and no more than one-fourth of the 12th grade pupils would have had to be enrolled in mathematics in 1900 in order to yield this 86% figure. But to equal this percentage figure in 1950, not only would all the freshmen and sophomores have had to be enrolled in mathematics, but so would two-thirds instead of but one-half of the juniors, and two-thirds instead of but one-fourth of the seniors.

[1] *Statistics of Public Secondary Day Schools, 1951–52*, p. 7.

Now for a word about our second consideration. The USOE reports that approximately 88%, 81%, 66%, and 55%, respectively, of all the youths in this country aged 14, 15, 16, and 17 were attending the public high school in 1956–57.[1] The proportions so enrolled in 1900 were in the order of 16%, 10%, 4%, and 3%—the computations are too lengthy to reproduce here, but it can be seen that these calculations are in harmony with the fact that only 8% of all youths aged 14–17 were then attending the public high school, and that of this little handful some 47%, 30%, 13%, and 10% were enrolled in grades 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively. When it is remembered that something in the order of 7% of the youth population are enrolled in private schools, and that these youths quite generally come from homes in which advanced education is valued, it is evident that there is an enormous range of differences in respect to the home backgrounds, and hence in the conditioning, of the pupils in today's public secondary schools—a range far greater than was true in 1900. It was a recognition of this fact that led the Harvard Committee to speak of "the new part" which "the high school has been called on to play" in these words: "It is, in essence, the incomparably difficult task of meeting in ways which they severally respect and will respond to, masses of students of every conceivable shade of intelligence, background, means, interest, and expectation. Unlike the old high school in which no one was compelled to stay if he could not or did not wish to do the work, the modern high school must find place for every kind of student whatever his hopes and talents."[2]

Finally, a few observations regarding our third consideration. The presumption is very great that nearly all who attended the public high school in 1900, and especially those who got beyond the 9th grade, had the kinds of home backgrounds, interests, and capacities that made it possible for them to succeed in and profit from work in mathematics and science beyond the beginning courses in these subjects. No informed person, I think, is likely to believe that this is true today. Only about half of that 81% of the 15-year-old youths who are enrolled in the 10th grade today can be expected either to perform very capably in or to benefit very much from plane geometry, for example. Nor can we reasonably expect more than about half of that 66% of all youths aged 16 who are our present-day juniors to be fitted for intermediate algebra, or that the rigors of trigonometry are within the capabilities of more than about two-thirds of that 55% of all 17-year-olds in today's senior class.

In view of the three considerations just noted, I doubt that Professor Mansfield has much warrant for believing that the comparison between the 1900 and the "now" percentage figures in respect to enrollments is significant in the sense that it reflects unfavorably on the present-day high school.

IV

This brings us to Professor Mansfield's third point—his implication that the present-day high school should perhaps hang its head because it is not enrolling 47%, 55%, and 54% of all youths aged 14–17 in foreign languages, mathematics, and science courses, respectively. This expectation can be regarded as reasonable only if it can be demonstrated that today's high school is simply enrolling a larger number of youths with the same capabilities for

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 44.
[2] *General Education in a Free Society*, p. 9.

and interests in academic pursuits that characterized the little group who were enrolled in 1900. We have already seen that the very opposite of this circumstance is in fact the case today.

Harold C. Hand

Rejoinder by Professor Mansfield

I have read Professor Hand's comments on the criticisms which I offered on his article "Black Horses Eat More Than White Horses." I must say that I remain unconvinced. Perhaps this is to be expected, since the participants in an argument rarely convince each other, but only themselves. But the basic question at issue is, I think, extremely important and deserves to be made absolutely clear. This is the question: In the process of expanding the scale of our educational efforts, we have necessarily used more and more resources (labor, bricks, mortar, etc.) to produce the end product. Have we utilized these resources efficiently? Do we, that is to say, get as much education *per unit of resources devoted to producing it* as we did, say, in 1900? I believe Professor Hand would say that we do, although I think he shifts his ground during the course of his argument from the position of saying we do to the position of saying that it is not the fault of public school personnel if we do not. I believe, on the other hand, that he has shown fairly conclusively that our educational plant is not as efficient as it used to be.

In the first place, I cannot feel very much amazement at the close correspondence between his computed figures for percentage enrollment in the various mathematics courses and the U. S. Office of Education figures—for the very good reason that they are computed on precisely the same basis.[1]

Both Professor Hand and the USOE expressed the number of students taking any given mathematics course as a percentage of the number of students in the grade *in which that course is normally offered*. But, I must repeat, there is no guarantee that every student takes a course in the grade in which it is normally offered.[2] Some (unknown) percentage of students who take any mathematics course can be assumed to fail it, repeat it, and thus show up in the statistics more than once.[3] To the extent that this happens, it necessarily reduces the percentage of all high-school students that we can say with certainty have been exposed to *any* mathematics, not to say the advanced courses.

According to Professor Hand's own reasoning, we should expect a

[1] *Editor's Note.* In returning galley proof, Professor Hand wrote, in part: "Regardless of whether or not [such correspondence] is any cause for amazement, the fact that there is a close correspondence between my computations for 1948–49 and those for 1954 and 1956 arrived at by the U. S. Office of Education (when it first began to report data based on the method of reckoning employed in my article) seems to me to remove any reasonable 'doubt' about the accuracy of my figures."

[2] The USOE figures which Professor Hand quotes show that "The number of pupils enrolled in elementary algebra . . . in 1954 was 64.5 per cent of the number of pupils in the 9th grade. . . . The USOE also reported that the [1954] enrollment in general mathematics was equal to [44.5 per cent] of the pupils in the 9th grade." This adds up to 109 per cent of the pupils in the 9th grade.

[3] *Editor's Note.* In returning galley proof, Professor Hand wrote: "Such situations do not 'show up in the statistics more than once'—this because all the enrollment data involved are those for but one school year."

higher flunk rate now than in 1900, since "The presumption is very great that nearly all who attended the public high school in 1900 . . . had the kinds of home backgrounds, interests, and capacities that made it possible for them to succeed in . . . mathematics. . . . No informed person, I think, is likely to believe that this is true today." If flunk rates are no higher today, this must be because either: (a) teaching methods have greatly improved, or (b) standards of performance required of students have fallen.

The conclusion to which we are impelled is that Professor Hand's figures and those of the Office of Education neither prove nor disprove his contention that 98% of all high-school students have been exposed to some form of math.

II

Even if we grant this contention, however, it is easy to show, using Professor Hand's own figures, that a smaller percentage of students are taking *advanced* mathematics courses now than in 1900. He notes that the grade-level distribution of students is quite different now than in 1900: 47, 30, 13, and 10% in 1900 for the respective four grades, against 31, 27, 23, and 19% in 1950.

In 1900, 86% of all students were taking mathematics. Professor Hand says, "We have good reason to believe that two years of mathematics was commonly required in that era. If this was indeed the case, only one-half of the 11th and no more than one-fourth of the 12th grade pupils would have had to be enrolled in mathematics in 1900 in order to yield this 86% figure. But to equal this percentage figure in 1950, not only would all the freshmen and sophomores have had to be enrolled in mathematics (*horribile dictu!*), but so would two-thirds instead of but one-half of the juniors, and two-thirds instead of but one-fourth of all the seniors."

But suppose that the same percentage of all grade levels were enrolled in mathematics courses in 1950 as he assumes was true in 1900, *i.e.*, all the freshmen, all the sophomores, one-half of the juniors, and one-fourth of the seniors. That would give us a figure of 74% of the entire student body taking math in 1950. Instead, what do we have? 55%.

III

My quarrel with Professor Hand, aside from his use of statistics, is, I suspect, one of goals. He provides two apologies for the public high schools. One is that "it is generally only the youths in the upper third of the intelligence distribution who can succeed in and profit from advanced courses in mathematics and science." The other is that "very frequently it is only those from homes in which advanced education is highly valued who are willing to submit themselves to the rigors of these subjects."

As for the first statement, certainly the extension of public education to a much larger segment of the population poses great problems to the public schools. If it is really true that only one-third of those of high-school age can master "advanced" mathematics, then it is perhaps not reasonable to ask them to try.[1] But this constitutes a valid apology for the public schools only if they continue to demand the best efforts of which the student is capable. I

[1] I do not concede the point. I only advance it as a basis for argument.

would look with much greater equanimity on a declining percentage of mathematics enrollment if I thought it were due to a segregation of students into different curricula according to their abilities and not, as I suspect, the result of a progressive watering-down of requirements in order to permit everybody to pass a single set of requirements. It may even be that we have carried the whole idea of free public education too far. Perhaps it may be a waste of resources to try to give *everybody* a secondary education. "Democracy in education," as the current phrase goes, certainly should not mean merely universality of incarceration in an institution called a high school. Democracy, whatever it is, is not the equation of unequals.[1]

I am not certain what Professor Hand means by his second statement. If he means only that students often display an amazing ingenuity at resisting knowledge, and that in many cases home backgrounds contribute to this attitude, he will, I am sure, find universal agreement. I suspect, however, the implication that a student who is unwilling to "submit [himself] to the rigors" of, say, trigonometry because (for example) he just doesn't like the subject should not be required to do so. The notion that a high school student is a qualified judge of what courses he should take is, it seems to me, quite untenable. The fact that students, if left to their own inclinations, will avoid "difficult" subjects does not constitute a defense of the high schools for not requiring them.

If I have attributed to Professor Hand any argument that he did not mean to imply, I apologize.

Lawrence F. Mansfield

[1] *Editor's Note.* Concerning the last paragraph in section III of Professor Mansfield's "Rejoinder," Professor Hand comments that "this implied criticism of the present-day high school is warranted only if it is reasonable to suppose that all the sophomores (81% of all the 15 year olds in the U. S. A.), one half of all the juniors (66% of all 16 year olds), and one fourth of all the seniors (55% of all 17 year olds) have the capacity to succeed in and benefit themselves and society from non-watered-down courses in plane geometry, intermediate algebra, solid geometry, and trigonometry, respectively." Professor Hand quotes Dr. James B. Conant as stating (in two public addresses delivered in April and May, 1958, on his current study of the American high school) that only "about 15% of the high school population on a national basis" has the capacity to "study effectively and rewardingly" the "tough advanced courses in mathematics, science, and foreign languages." (Titles of addresses: "Some Problems of the American High School: a Preliminary Report of a Study," and "Dr. Conant Looks at the Illinois High School"; both mimeographed by A Study of the American High School, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York.)

Corrigenda

By EDWIN MOISE
University of Michigan

Following are various corrections of Professor Harold C. Hand's corrections of Professor Arthur Bestor's remarks on trends in high-school education since the year 1900.[1]

II

In his interview, Professor Bestor said that

. . . more than half of the high schools in the United States offer no physics; roughly a quarter offer neither physics nor chemistry. And even geometry is missing in 23% of our high schools.

According to Professor Hand, while these statements are correct, they are misleading, because the schools with deficient offerings tend to be small schools. He goes on to say that

The U. S. Office of Education pamphlet which supplies these data states that the institutions which do not offer geometry enroll the equivalent of only about 2 per cent of all public high-school pupils in this country and that the schools which offer neither chemistry nor physics enroll the equivalent of less than 2 per cent of the total public secondary population.

The whole context of these remarks indicates that it is Pamphlet 118 that is being cited. But these figures are not to be found in Pamphlet 118. What the pamphlet really does say is that in 1954, 5.8% of the twelfth-grade students were in schools which offered no chemistry or physics, and 6.8% of all tenth-grade students were in schools which offered no plane geometry.

It appears that Professor Hand has divided each of these percentages by four. Thus the index that he is using for, say, geometry, is *one-fourth of the percentage of students who, on entering the tenth grade, find that there is no geometry course available to them.* If such unexpected indices as this are to be used as measures of educational opportunity, then their definitions should be stated and their rationale should be explained.

III

Professor Hand has explained the meaning of the percentage enrollment in a given subject in a given year. For example, the percentage enrollment in mathematics for 1950 is the total enrollment of all high school mathematics classes in 1950, divided by the total enrollment of all high schools in 1950. To get the percentage enrollment in science in 1950, you add the percentage enrollments in the various sciences. Hereafter, for the sake of convenience,

[1] I am indebted to Professor Hand for pointing out an error, or at best a *non sequitur*, of my own (in my first draft of this article), in connection with enrollment statistics in English for the year 1900; the situation in this regard is more obscure than I realized when I first drafted this article.

we shall speak of percentage enrollments simply as enrollments; since these figures will always be percentages, no confusion should occur.

Professor Bestor computed the enrollments in science, mathematics, and foreign languages for 1900 and for "today." ("Today" really means the academic year 1948–49, the last year for which the figures were available.) He reported that in this fifty-year period the science enrollment had gone down from 84% to 54%, the mathematics enrollment from 86% to 55%, and the foreign languages enrollment from nearly three quarters to less than 22%. These figures were given as evidence that the emphasis in teaching had shifted away from the fundamental subjects.

Professor Hand is disturbed about the way in which these figures have been misunderstood. For example, given that the enrollment in mathematics was 55% in 1949, the reader might infer that the following statement is true:

Statement A. At the present time, only 55% of the 9th-grade students take a 9th-grade mathematics course, in the 9th grade or later.

Professor Hand is at pains to show that Statement A is false. It should, however, be understood that Statement A is not what Professor Bestor said. What he said, verbatim, was that

> in 1900 nearly 84 per cent of all American high-school students were taking some science courses. That has dropped to 54 per cent today. In mathematics the drop has been from 86 to 55 per cent.

Taken literally, and rightly understood, this is correct. Moreover, it is the comparison that was emphasized; and the comparison is valid.[1] It remains to consider how badly a casual reader would have been misled if he misunderstood Professor Bestor's remarks, and inferred wrongly that Statement A was true.

Professor Hand gives an elaborate analysis of enrollments in the various high-school mathematics courses. In this analysis, it appears that the following statement is true:

Statement B. At the present time, only about 37% of the 10th-grade students take a 10th-grade mathematics course, in the 10th grade or later.

To most readers, Statement B would seem just as sensational as Statement A; both convey the same qualitative impression of the sort of place that mathematics has in high-school study. In fact, to realize that these statements are incongruous with one another, the reader would have to know enough about enrollments to be aware of the tremendous number of students who take one, or perhaps both, of the 9th-grade courses, but go no further. (According to Professor Hand's figures, the total enrollment of the two 9th-grade courses is more than triple the enrollment of the 10th-grade course.) But a reader as well informed as this would hardly have misunderstood Professor Bestor's remarks in the first place.

We may get a clue to Professor Hand's viewpoint from a statistical index that he emphasizes. By a lengthy analysis, he computes what one might call the Exposure Index. He reports that over 95% of high-school seniors have

[1] While the percentage of seniors increased greatly from 1900 to 1950, trigonometry enrollment increased only from 1.9% to 2%; thus it is hard to explain the drop in percentage mathematics enrollment merely on the basis of a shift in grade-level distribution of students.

taken *some* work in mathematics, at *some* point of their high-school careers; and he quotes an unnamed informant to the effect that "well over 90% of all high-school pupils are now taking one or more science courses during their stay in high school."

If the study of mathematics or science were an all-or-none process, like vaccination against smallpox, then the Exposure Index would be the important thing to compute. But as a measure of the sort of place that a given subject has in the curriculum, the Exposure Index is remarkably uninformative, because it takes no account at all of the depth to which the given subject is pursued. It seems to be designed not so much to reflect the facts as to please people who are easily pleased.

IV

Consider the following argument, implicitly attributed to Professor Bestor:

Argument A. The percentage enrollment in mathematics and science is only about two thirds of what it was in 1900; and the percentage enrollment in foreign languages is less than a third of what it was then. Therefore youths of high school age are learning less about fundamental subjects than in 1900.

This argument is invalid, having two defects, either of which is fatal.

In the first place it is obvious that two good courses can easily be worth more than three bad ones. For this reason, percentage enrollments cannot measure the success of the efforts of the high schools; they can only indicate the directions in which these efforts are exerted. Therefore Argument A would be very inconclusive, even if gross high-school enrollment, relative to population, had remained constant since 1900.

But as everybody knows, gross high-school enrollment relative to population has enormously increased. If it has merely doubled, then the nation's youths are taking more mathematics and science courses, per capita, then they did in 1900.

Professor Hand gives the exact figures. In 1900, 8% of high-school age youths were actually going to high school. By 1950, this percentage had risen to 64%. It follows that the youths of today are taking 5 times as many mathematics and science courses, per capita, as their predecessors did; and $2^1/_3$ times as many of them are studying foreign languages.[1]

Thus it appears that Argument A is quite without merit. It remains to consider whether such an argument was advanced by Professor Bestor in his interview. The answer to this question is No.

At only one point in the interview does Professor Bestor explicitly claim that the total high-school age population is educationally worse off than it was in 1900. At this point, on p. 72, he is asked whether "boys and girls are better educated today than they were in 1900, or less so?" He answers that they are, on the whole, less well educated. He goes on to say that

> Today the able student in a good city or suburban high school can doubtless obtain an equally good education if he wants to. But he is much less likely to be kept to the fundamentals if he decides he wants to fool around with easy courses. . . . The story is a little different for students of merely average

[1] For an earlier statement of substantially the same point, see the quotation from M. L. Hartung, in a footnote on p. 18 of Bestor's *Restoration of Learning*.

ability. Lots of them would have dropped out of school in 1900. Now they are likely to continue, and so, on paper, they are better educated. But the courses for them have usually been watered down so that the real gain isn't very great. . . ."

He goes on to speak of students' being allowed to "get by without serious effort," and so developing "sloppy habits of thinking that are almost worse than ignorance itself."

Here the reader may find an allusion to enrollment figures, in the remarks on the able students. But Professor Bestor's conclusion is based primarily on his exceedingly low opinion of what actually goes on in most high-school classrooms; he is claiming that the deterioration of the courses has been so great that it more than balances the increase in gross volume of effort. (As one might expect, this passage is preceded by lengthy and varied complaints, only one of which is conveyed by the enrollment figures.) In saying these things, Professor Bestor may be wrong. At least, let us all hope that he is. But he is not involved in a statistical fallacy, for the excellent reason that he is not offering a statistical argument. In particular, he is not involved in the statistical fallacy which was attributed to him by Professor Hand on pp. 271–2 of his article.

Professor Hand expresses a low opinion of Argument A. It is an "ancient wheeze" and an "old chestnut"; it "withholds a key datum." These judgments are not pertinent to a discussion of Professor Bestor's interview.

V

The above analysis has been given merely in order to set the record straight. Rather little of it has any important bearing on the main thesis of Professor Bestor's interview, or, for that matter, any important bearing on the problems of public policy.

Just after his extreme remarks, to the effect that education of the high-school age population has actually gotten worse in the last fifty years, Professor Bestor goes on to say that he

> . . . would rather compare the present achievement of American education not so much with the past as with the results that we ought to be getting out of the much greater investment that we are now making in education. We're spending enough to give every American child the kind of sound education that only a fraction of them could have had half a century ago. . . .

To any one who has read the interview, it is clear that this second assertion is its main thesis; it is the thesis that Professor Bestor is prepared to insist upon; and it is the thesis that really matters, from the standpoint of public policy.

Comments on Professor Moise's "Corrigenda"

In commenting on Professor Moise's criticisms of my "Black Horses, etc." article, I have numbered the sections of my paper to make them correspond to the numbering scheme employed in his.

II

In respect to his first point, Professor Moise is incorrect in assuming that I performed any divisions of percentage figures to arrive at the equivalents

I reported; instead, I dealt only with the base numbers involved. But he is quite justified in saying that the rationale for the employment of these indices should have been explained. This rationale is self-evident to anyone who has either attended or taught in one or more of our 1800 high schools in which the total enrollment is fewer than 50 pupils, but it is probable that but few of the readers of the *Bulletin* have had either of these experiences. Characteristically, these are the schools in which geometry, chemistry, and/or physics may be missing from the curriculum in any given year, yet show up on the program of studies during one or the other of the two or three ensuing years. This practice of alternating subjects commonly results in students from two and sometimes from three or more grade levels being enrolled in the same subject. Hence it is quite untrue, for example, that the number of pupils who miss out on the opportunity to take plane geometry is equivalent to 6.8% of the 10th grade pupils in this country. The actual figure is much closer to 2%, for reasons which I hope I have now made clear.

III

In his next section, Professor Moise offers three observations that seem to me to require comment. One is that the comparisons between the enrollment figures for 1900 and 1950 in science (84%; 54%) and mathematics (86%; 55%) which were drawn by Professor Bestor are "valid." I believe that these comparisons are in major part spurious for reasons I shall now attempt to make clear.

Pertinent again in this connection are the U. S. Office of Education figures and reports on two school systems, previously cited (p. 483) to demonstrate such differences in grade-level distributions between 1900 and now that in 1950 the enrollment of all 9th, 10th, and 11th grade pupils in mathematics would have produced a percentage only 4 points greater (81 against 77) than the percentage would have been if the subject had been required of all 9th, 10th, and 11th grade pupils in 1900.

My second comment is, I hope, neither mistaken nor unfair. It is that in offering his "Statement A" Professor Moise implies that I attributed such a statement to Professor Bestor. I did not do so. Instead, my point was that when Professor Bestor's readers were told that the enrollment figure in mathematics had dropped from 86% in 1900 to 55% "today," they would mistakenly infer that some 45% of today's high-school graduates took no work in mathematics during their high-school careers. In substantiation of my belief that this mistaken inference would be drawn, I took note of a news item in the February 19, 1957 issue of the *New York Times* in which the remarks of a college president before a national convention were reported—remarks which if quoted in full would be seen to be but a paraphrase of the statistics given in the graph which appears on page 71 of Professor Bestor's article: "only 55 per cent of high-school students now take courses in mathematics or science," the president is reported to have said in part. Further, if the reactions of a group of university students may be offered in evidence, the results of one part of a little exercise anonymously completed by 114 students in a sociology class on my own campus may be of interest. These students were given Professor Bestor's exact words from the *U. S. News and World Report*, as follows:

The figures of the U. S. Office of Education show that in 1900 nearly 84 per cent of all American high-school students were taking some science courses. That has dropped to only 54 per cent today. In mathematics the drop has been from 86 to 55 per cent.

The students were then asked to state approximately, on the basis of Professor Bestor's statement, "what percentage of the students who graduated from high school in 1956 or 1957 had taken no high-school course" in, respectively, science and mathematics. Blanks were left for the insertion of answers. Approximately two thirds of the 114 students said the implication was that 46% of the high-school graduates had taken no work in science and that 45% had taken no mathematics. About one fourth said it implied that some larger percentage had taken no science or mathematics courses. The remainder, about one tenth, either did not respond (3 students) or variously said the implication was that from 3% to 30% of the high-school graduates had taken no work in these subjects.[1]

This brings us to Professor Moise's "Statement B." If by "a 10th-grade mathematics course" he means to connote plane geometry, he is correct in saying that my excursion into statistics showed that about 37% of the sophomores in the typical high school were enrolled in this subject in the school year designated as "today" by Professor Bestor. Actually, my analysis indicated that about half (47%) of the 10th-grade pupils were enrolled in some mathematics subject. Professor Moise seems to infer that this figure for plane geometry should be much larger—note that he says "*only* about 37%." If Professor Moise does indeed believe that a much larger fraction of the 10th-grade youngsters should be enrolled in plane geometry, I invite him to consider the views of President Conant who, on the basis of extended visits to high schools all over the nation and his observations of the great range in the academic aptitudes of the pupils, is recommending that the school counselors in communities in which the distribution of academic ability or scholastic aptitude corresponds to the national average should "guide not more than half of the boys and girls in the ninth grade into algebra, the others into general mathematics or commercial mathematics."[2] At the last report from the U. S. Office of Education, the enrollment in plane geometry was equivalent to 42% of the number of pupils found in the 10th grade.[3] If these are with but few exceptions the more academically able youngsters, I doubt that this enrollment figure of 42% should be increased to any very appreciable extent.

Professor Moise's comments in the concluding part of Section II of his paper relate to what he calls my "Exposure Index." Here he takes me to task for not doing what I did not set out to do. In the part of my article to which he refers here, I set out to demonstrate that something quite contrary

[1] *Editor's Note.* In a letter to the Editor, Professor Moise points out what he regards as "a major weakness" in this argument, in that "if you ask a man to answer a certain question on the basis of certain data, you thereby strongly suggest to him that the question can be answered on the basis of the given data. Thus the question used in the experiment strongly suggested that Exposure Indices could be computed arithmetically on the basis of Bestor's figures; and the latter point is the very point that is supposed to be at issue. I grant, and always did grant, that the thesis . . . is plausible. But in attempting to 'prove' it with such evidence as this, Professor Hand is needlessly discrediting his case."

[2] James B. Conant, "The Public High School and the National Interest," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, Vol. 42, No. 237, April 1958, p. 346.

[3] *Offerings and Enrollments in Science and Mathematics in Public High Schools, 1956*, p. 31.

to the conclusion that "We Are Less Educated Than 50 Years Ago" is warranted by the enrollment data quoted by Professor Bestor when they are related to the population to which his conclusion applies. This, it seems to me, I accomplished; what Professor Moise calls my "Exposure Index" does, I believe, faithfully "reflect the facts" with which I was dealing. Professor Bestor employed the criterion of comparative enrollments, it will be remembered, and it is from such data that the so-called exposure indices were derived. I have no quarrel with anyone who wishes to interject more depth into our subjects of instruction.

IV

In Section IV of his paper Professor Moise seems to be saying that Professor Bestor employed no enrollment statistics in support of the contention that today's high-school students are learning less about the fundamental subjects than they did in 1900. I disagree. When one picks up a copy of the November 30, 1956 issue of *U. S. News & World Report* he sees emblazoned on the outside cover this quotation attributed to Professor Bestor: "We Are Less Educated Than 50 Years Ago." When he turns to the article he finds the same statement set forth in quotation marks as its title. The fourth question in the interview was this: "Are the schools paying less attention to the teaching of science, mathematics, history and foreign languages than they used to?" To which Professor Bestor replied: "Yes, they are. In fact, lots of American high schools don't even offer courses in the basic sciences and advanced mathematics, that is, geometry and algebra. And an increasing percentage of American students aren't taking the courses even when they are offered." The seventh question put to Professor Bestor was: "Is there a relationship, do you think, between the shortage of scientists you hear so much about today and what we have been doing with education in the last 30 to 50 years?" To which he replied: "A very obvious relationship. The figures of the U. S. Office of Education show that in 1900 nearly 84 per cent of all American high-school students were taking some science courses. That has dropped to only 54 per cent today. In mathematics the drop has been from 86 to 55 per cent." And on page 71, under the title of "What's Wrong with Teaching in U. S.?" and with the sub-heading "Here Is One Educator's Answer," a graph is presented in which the comparative enrollment statistics for 1900 and "now" in science and mathematics are given, with this notation at the bottom of the graph: "Source: Dr. Arthur Bestor, history professor and president of the Council for Basic Education." In the face of this evidence, it seems to me quite mistaken to say that Professor Bestor did not employ the 1900 and 1950 enrollment statistics in support of the contention that "youths of high-school age are learning less about the fundamental subjects than they did in 1900."

Harold C. Hand

Tax Developments

1. Tax Deductibility of Doctoral Expenses

By unanimous decision, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (New York and Connecticut), reversing a decision by the Tax Court, recently held that the cost of obtaining a Ph.D. degree, or similar expenses, can be deducted for Income Tax purposes, if these expenses are required for the taxpayer to continue in the employment producing the income subject to tax, even though the expenses serve at the same time to advance the taxpayer in his profession, or contribute to his educational development. The case in question (*Marlor* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue*) was successfully argued by Professor Harrop A. Freeman, Professor of Law at Cornell University, a member of Subcommittee Z-2 on Taxation of the American Association of University Professors. The relation of the case to the new Internal Revenue regulation governing educational expenses is discussed below.

Professor Clark S. Marlor (now in the School of Speech, Adelphi College) was appointed in 1952 as a tutor in Queens College, New York City. The Bylaws of the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York provided that if a tutor had not obtained his Ph.D. within five years of his original appointment, he would "not be eligible for promotion to the rank of instructor . . . [or] for reappointment as a tutor." The same regulations required that, to continue in his position as a tutor, he must be making substantial progress toward the attainment of the doctorate. Thus, doctoral study served two purposes—(a) the retention by the teacher of his present position (the source of his taxable income), and (b) his qualification for a higher rank or a more remunerative position.

The opinion of the Court of Appeals was very short:

We agree in all respects with the dissenting opinion of Judge [Arnold] Raum [of the Tax Court], 27 T.C. 624(1956). *Hill* v. *Commissioner*, 4 Cir., 181 F. 2d 906. Reversed.

The opinion of Judge Raum (in which two other Tax Court judges concurred), which was thus accepted by the Court of Appeals, is as follows:

Raum, J., dissenting: The expenses incurred by petitioner had a dual objective. On the one hand, the attainment of the doctorate was necessary in order to qualify for appointment to the permanent staff, and

I assume, *arguendo,* that if such were the only purpose, the expenses would not be deductible any more than educational expenses generally that are incurred by one who is preparing for his profession or calling in life. On the other hand, petitioner's work toward his doctorate had a much more immediate objective. He held a temporary appointment as a tutor and it was made clear to him that it was necessary for him to make substantial progress toward the doctorate in order to retain his position as tutor. In short, the expenses incurred by petitioner were necessary in order to earn the very income which the Commissioner seeks to tax. I find it very difficult to see why such expenses do not qualify as "ordinary and necessary" business expenses. Petitioner's position is supported by *Hill* v. *Commissioner,* 181 F. 2d 906 (C.A.4), which is not satisfactorily distinguished in the majority Opinion.

Professor Freeman's argument before the Court of Appeals included the following:

> This Court and other courts have properly recognized that preliminary education and training of a person for the purpose of entering a profession is a personal expense and non-deductible. This is true for lawyers, doctors, teachers, actors—anyone. But once the person has entered on his professional career, then all expenses that are necessary for him to keep proficient, retain his job and advance in his profession are deductible. And these allowable expenses specifically include education or training.

Professor Freeman believes that the Courts will eventually have to apply the rules he advocated, particularly the Second Circuit Court, because of *Coughlin* v. *Commissioner,* 203 F. 2d 307, *Hill* v. *Commissioner,* 181 F. 2d 906, *Cohan* v. *Commissioner,* 39 F. 2d 540, and *Blackmer* v. *Commissioner,* 70 F. 2d 255. However, because, in the Marlor case, study for the doctorate had a dual purpose, and because it was required by the employer, it was possible for the Court to escape the wider issue by relying on the Hill case, which also involved expenditures by a teacher for studies that enabled her to retain her position in the Virginia public schools.

The Marlor decision should be of considerable help to young teachers. Before deducting expenses of this variety, however, it will be wise to see that the employer requires their incurrence in order to retain the existing position, even though they may also relate to future advancement.

The significance of the decision in the Marlor case is emphasized by the fact that the Association's Subcommittee Z-2 on Taxation thought the chances of success were not great, and Mr. Freeman handled the matter voluntarily at Professor Marlor's request. The Association, through Subcommittee Z-2, is assisting in a number of other cases which are now in process.

2. New Income Tax Regulations

Final regulations were promulgated[1] under Section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on April 5, 1958. Section 162 of the Code permits the deduction of "ordinary and necessary" business expenses, the provision under which the major portion of deductible professional expenses of professors must qualify. One section[2] of the regulations deals with "Expenses for Education." These are made deductible under the conditions specified. This section is new to the income tax regulations, there having been no comparable section at the time of the enactment of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The section in its final form has been changed substantially from the comparable section in the regulations as originally proposed. These changes no doubt resulted from suggestions made to the Internal Revenue Service by the American Association of University Professors and by other interested organizations and persons.

The Secretary of the Treasury has referred to the new regulations as "more liberal."[3] This conclusion appears appropriate in regard to one former area of controversy—the summer school expenses of high school and elementary teachers. However, the regulations, whether intentionally or not, are far from liberal in two areas of prime concern to college and university teachers. These areas are (1) research expenses and (2) expenses of completing a terminal degree.

A parenthetical expression "including research activities"[4] in the first sentence of the regulation indicates that the same standards as to deductibility will be applied to both research expenses and educational expenses. It is likely that this resulted from a brief filed by the American Association of University Professors, calling attention to the absence of any provision in the proposed regulations recognizing the deductibility of research expenses. In fact, this is the first time the income tax regulations have ever specifically recognized the deductibility of the research expenses of professors.

Under the regulations, research expenses are deductible if they were undertaken primarily for either of two purposes: "(1) Maintaining or improving skills required by the taxpayer in his employment or other trade or business, or (2) Meeting the express requirements of a taxpayer's employer, or the requirements of applicable law or regulations, imposed as a condition to the retention by the taxpayer of his salary, status or employment."[5] The second of these tests coincides with what many Internal Revenue employees thought to be the prior rule as to the

[1] Section 1.162, 23 Federal Register, p. 2244 (April 5, 1958).
[2] Section 1.162-5.
[3] Press Release A-207, April 4, 1958, quoting letter to Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.
[4] Section 1.162-5 (a).
[5] *Ibid.*

deductibility of research expenses. It is, of course, the much narrower of the two tests. Since colleges and universities do not order faculty members to conduct specific research projects under pain of dismissal, this second test will have little application to research expenses.

The first test—"maintaining and improving skills"—may, however, be of help in obtaining for academic persons deductions for research expenses. This interpretation will be aided by the following sentence from the regulations: "If it is customary for other established members of the taxpayer's trade or business to undertake such education [including research activities], the taxpayer will ordinarily be considered to have undertaken this education for [the purpose of maintaining and improving skills and the expenses will be deductible]."[1]

The argument that research is customary, that it therefore has for its purpose "maintaining and improving skills," and that it therefore is deductible is circuitous; and even if it prevails, is not a satisfactory and realistic analysis of the problem. While research and writing will presumably maintain and improve skills in researching, is that the primary goal of research? Or is research undertaken primarily because one of the functions of a university is to add to mankind's store of knowledge? Of course, the technique for a university to gather new knowledge is to employ faculty members who are expected to conduct research. A direct and easily understood test would be whether research was expected of professors. If so, their research expenses should be deductible. Such a test could and should be added to the regulations.

In a brief[2] filed with the Internal Revenue Service, the American Association of University Professors urged a clear differentiation between research and education expenses, and the adoption of the test suggested above as to the deductibility of research expenses. It is the intention of the Association to continue its efforts to obtain a clear recognition of the deductibility of these expenses. There are two cases now pending before the Tax Court and supported by the Association which it is hoped will clarify some of the confusion in the present regulations.

One recurrent example of research expenses is travel during a sabbatical leave which is being used to carry out a research project. The wording of the regulations as to such expenses is most unfortunate. The regulations provide that "a taxpayer's expenditures for travel (including travel while on sabbatical leave) as a form of education" will "in general" be non-deductible.[3] This language can be interpreted as applying only when the travel itself is the goal, rather than travel incidental to some other goal, such as the conduct of research. Such an interpretation is

[1] *Ibid.*
[2] See 43 *AAUP Bulletin* 554, September, 1957.
[3] Section 1.162-5(c).

aided somewhat by a subsequent provision in the regulations that expenses of travel "primarily to obtain education" are deductible, if the education itself meets either of the two tests otherwise applicable to education expenses.[1] However, it is feared that many Internal Revenue personnel will interpret the regulations as a blanket prohibition against the deduction of any sabbatical leave travel expenses. Their interpretation will be that the parenthetical expression, "including travel while on sabbatical leave," is an example to illustrate when travel itself is "a form of education." This tendency toward this interpretation will be strengthened by Rev. Rul. 55-412,[2] which many revenue agents have been citing as authority to disallow all sabbatical leave travel expenses. To deny deductions for sabbatical travel leave expenses is, as academic people well understand, a great injustice. See *AAUP Bulletin*, September, 1957, pp. 507–511, for suggestions on how to proceed so that the chances will be greatest for approval of such deductions, if they are challenged.

Through a fortunate coincidence in timing, there has just been filed in the Tax Court of the United States (with the support of the Association) a test case involving sabbatical leave travel expenses. It is hoped that this case, in which a decision will probably not be rendered for a year or more, will lead to the establishment of a just rule—one which would certainly be different from that now being applied by many revenue agents who disallow the deduction of all sabbatical leave travel expenses.

Not only as to research expenses, but also as to expenses of completing a terminal degree, the regulations are much less satisfactory to the profession than one might be led to believe by the press reports. After setting forth the two general tests for deductibility of education expenses, various qualifications and limitations are made. One of these is that, "In any event, if education is required of the taxpayer in order to meet the minimum requirements for qualification or establishment in his intended trade or business or specialty therein," the expense is not deductible.[3] The damaging impact of this sentence is made clear by this example from the regulations: "G, a graduate student at a university, plans to become a university professor. In order to qualify as a regular faculty member, G must obtain a graduate degree. While taking the required graduate courses, G is engaged in teaching at the university. G's expenses therefor are not deductible, since he has not completed the education required to become qualified as a regular faculty member at the time he takes such courses."[4]

[1] Section 1.162-5(d).
[2] C.B. 1955-1, 318. This ruling is discussed in "Sabbatical Leave Travel Expenses and the Federal Income Tax," 43 *AAUP Bulletin* 507, September, 1957.
[3] Section 1.162-5(b).
[4] Section 1.162-5(e), Example (7).

Thus it is highly doubtful that the Washington headquarters of the Internal Revenue Service is ready to acquiesce in the victory, discussed above, which was won by Professor Freeman in the *Marlor* case before the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It must be concluded that the new regulations are not in a satisfactory form. But as noted above, test cases are being and will be pushed in an effort to improve the tax position of the profession.

Sixty-five

No more the morning's sudden thrill of joy,
The gently tolling bell, the feel of chalk,
Tired students' eyes, ideas in endless flow;
No more the atom's soul, proud walls of Troy,
Sad poetry of living things. The talk,
The endless, lovely talk, is stopped, and so,
Not old, I leave the friends I love the most,
To be a guest where I have been a host.

To the Dean Upon Being Asked to Serve on a Committee

You say the course is clear, the path is straight?
I see. The duty done, the soul serene?
Of course. You say the mighty watch and wait?
The problem great; the end, though, quickly seen?

My talents are unique? Well, I don't know . . .
(I must not weaken now—the trap is set).
What's that? My perspicacity! Oh, no!
But, sir . . .
Aha . . .
It's not . . .
Well, if . . .
You bet!

Ralph Steinhardt, Jr.

Hollins College

Forty-fourth Annual Meeting

Denver, Cosmopolitan Hotel, April 25-26, 1958

A full account of the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Association, held on April 25–26 at Denver, Colorado, in the Cosmopolitan Hotel, and of the accompanying meetings of the Council, will be published in the Autumn *Bulletin*. What follow here are the program of the Annual Meeting, a brief report of the principal actions, and the resolutions adopted by the Meeting.

Program

Friday, April 25, 1958

10:00–12:30 P.M.—FIRST SESSION

Address of Welcome—Louis T. Benezet, President, Colorado College

Address and Panel Discussion—"Science and Humanities in Higher Education," Professor Eugene Rabinowitch, University of Illinois; Editor, *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. Panel members: Ian Campbell, Fritz Machlup, and Glenn R. Morrow

Report of the General Secretary

2:00– 5:00 P.M.—SECOND SESSION

Report of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Bentley Glass, The Johns Hopkins University, Chairman

Consideration of Committee A Recommendations

7:00—DINNER SESSION

Presiding Officer—George Pope Shannon, Associate Secretary

Guests of Honor—Alexander Meiklejohn and Laurence F. Whittemore

Presentation of the first Alexander Meiklejohn Award for Academic Freedom

Address—Helen C. White, University of Wisconsin, President of the American Association of University Professors

Saturday, April 26, 1958

8:00– 9:15 A.M.—Breakfast meeting of state and regional conference officers

9:30–12:30 P.M.—THIRD SESSION

Consideration of Committee A Recommendations (continued)

Report of the Committee on Resolutions, John W. Caughey, University of California at Los Angeles, Chairman

Report of Committee Z on Economic Status of the Profession, William A. Neiswanger, University of Illinois, Chairman

Consideration of Committee Z Recommendations

2:00– 5:00 P.M.—FOURTH SESSION

Consideration of Committee Z Recommendations (continued)

Consideration and Endorsement of the Association of American Colleges-American Association of University Professors *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings*

Consideration and Endorsement of the Association of American Colleges-American Association of University Professors *Statement of Principles on Academic Retirement and Insurance Programs*

Report of Committee O on Organization and Policy, Warren Taylor, Oberlin College, Chairman

Consideration of proposed Constitutional Amendments

New business

Report on the annual election

* * *

PRESIDING OFFICER, Helen C. White, University of Wisconsin, President of the American Association of University Professors

PARLIAMENTARIAN, Professor Thorrel B. Fest, University of Colorado

Committee on Resolutions: John W. Caughey (Chairman), Ralph C. Barnhart, Edward C. Mack, Glenn R. Morrow, Helen C. White (*ex officio*), Robert K. Carr (*ex officio*)

Meetings in Conjunction with the Annual Meeting

Wednesday, April 23

10 A.M. and afternoon—Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure

Thursday, April 24

9:30 A.M.—Executive Committee of the Council

11:00 A.M. and 2:30 P.M.—Council Meeting

Sunday, April 27

8:00 A.M. and 2:00 P.M.—Council Meeting

The report of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure was presented by the chairman, Professor Bentley Glass (The Johns Hopkins University). Professor Glass reported the following disposition of cases for the year March 31, 1957–March 31, 1958:

Pending, March 30, 1957....	48	Closed by Central Office Staff	53
Received, March 31, 1957–March 31, 1958.....	40	Remaining in hands of Central Office Staff.....	35
Total	88	Total	88

On recommendation of Committee A and the Council, the Annual Meeting voted to remove its censure from the administrations of the University of California and of Rutgers University, with the expressed hope, in the latter case, "that further redress, in the shape of either reinstatement or hearings under the improved regulations, may be accorded the dismissed faculty members." The Meeting voted to remove its censure from the administration of Temple University, "on condition that, and whenever, the second paragraph in the recent addition to the University's regulations has been revised in a manner that meets the approval of this Association's Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure." Also on recommendation of Committee A and the Council, following the publication of reports of investigating committees in the *AAUP Bulletin* (Vol. 42, No. 4, Winter, 1956, and Vol. 44, No. 1, Spring, 1958), the Annual Meeting voted to censure the administrations of the following institutions: Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Dickinson College, Livingstone College, The University of Michigan, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, and Texas Technological College. Censure was withheld from the administration of New York University for a year, pending further investigation.

The first Meiklejohn Award (*Bulletin*, Autumn, 1957, p. 538) was made to Dr. Eldon L. Johnson, President of the University of New Hampshire, and the Board of Trustees of that University, for their "significant contribution to academic freedom during the year." Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn, in whose honor the award is conferred, was present. The award was presented by Professor Ralph F. Fuchs (Indiana University), Counsel of the Association and Chairman of the Award Committee, and was accepted by Mr. Laurence F. Whittemore, President of the Board of Trustees of the University of New Hampshire.

The results of the balloting for officers and Council members were announced; see, in this issue, page 389.

Changes were announced in the Central Office staff, effective September 1. These include the return of the General Secretary, Robert K. Carr, to his faculty position at Dartmouth College and the appointment, as his successor, of Staff Associate William P. Fidler (see page 391); the retirement of the Associate Secretary, George Pope Shannon; and the appointment to the Central Office staff of Dr. Louis Joughin, Assistant Director of the American Civil Liberties Union and Executive Director of its Committee on Academic Freedom. (Information on these and related matters will appear in the Autumn, 1958 *Bulletin*.)

The Annual Meeting adopted the following resolutions:

Problems of Enrollment and Educational Change

The Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors affirms its concern, as did the Forty-third Annual Meeting, over the problems certain to arise in connection with the current

increase in college and university enrollment. It again warns of the necessity of maintaining standards; and it again asserts the need of joint efforts by administrators and teachers in meeting a common problem.

In addition, the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting declares its concern over other problems of education which have recently given rise to wide discussion concerning objectives, curricula, and methods, and concerning the merits and defects of American education. This Meeting deplores the extremes to which some of this debate has led. It favors full discussion and prompt action on needed changes, but it warns against the hasty abandonment of any reasonably successful educational practice, or the adoption of a different practice simply because it is proclaimed as new.

Broad Basis for Federal Aid to Education

The Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors is encouraged to note that recent public concern for the state of education in this country has directed attention to the necessity for its improvement at all levels and in all fields. The most publicized suggestions for federal action presented to Congress, however, seem to emphasize the training of technicians and specialists in a few areas which have immediate practical application to national defense. We seriously question the wisdom and indeed the effectiveness of such a policy, even for the attainment of temporary advantage in a technological armaments race. We believe that any program designed for the betterment of education should foster the intellectual and cultural welfare of the whole individual. We therefore urge that plans for federal participation in the improvement of education, rather than stressing exclusively the importance of facilities for the study of science and mathematics, be widened to embrace provisions for the study of all subjects which prepare a free people to live in a free society.

Educational Opportunity and Freedom in Relation to Segregation

The Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors affirms the endorsement by the Forty-third Annual Meeting of the right of every individual of whatever race to free access to educational opportunity and commends those educational institutions, public and private, which are seeking to bring educational policy into conformity with this principle.

The Meeting deplores the continued resistance on the part of some governmental bodies and private groups to the elimination of segregated education and condemns efforts to subvert the effective achievement of those rights set forth by the decisions of the United States Supreme Court.

The Annual Meeting likewise condemns the efforts to deny employment to teachers or enrollment to students, because of race or because of advocacy of, or membership in, organizations promoting non-segregated education.

Higher Education in South Africa

The Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors expresses its support for the South African Universities in their struggle against compulsory race segregation and government control of higher education. It commends the Universities of Cape Town and of the Witwatersrand for the policy of non-segregation that they have traditionally pursued and for their vigorous resistance to the provisions of the recently proposed Separate Education Bill which would have required them to abandon this policy. The provisions of this bill for strict control by the government over the administration and the content of instruction in the separate institutions to be set up for the education of non-whites in South Africa are contrary to the very conception of an institution of higher education. In the name of humanity and of the higher learning which this bill sought to shackle, we protest its provisions and the government policy that inspired them.

Investigative Power of Legislative Committees

The Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors again emphasizes the interest which a democratic society has in the preservation of academic freedom, since the free quest for truth serves the general good and not the special interests of the few. The Meeting notes with satisfaction the recognition by the United States Supreme Court in the Sweezy and Watkins cases of the serious abridgment of academic freedom which has sometimes arisen from misuse of the power of investigation by legislative committees. The Meeting calls upon the Congress of the United States and the legislatures of the several states to weigh carefully the uses of the investigative power in the light of these pronouncements by the Supreme Court and to take such positive steps as are necessary to safeguard the vital interest of society in the freedom indispensable to the continuing search for truth. For its own part, this Meeting endorses the view that refusal to divulge information concerning political affiliation to a legislative investigating committee shall not, in and of itself, be considered to be an act of misconduct.

Appointment Opportunities for Dismissed Teachers

The Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors notes with regret that a number of professors dismissed on grounds that the Association has found to be inadequate or

improper have been unable to find employment as teachers or researchers. The Annual Meeting calls the attention of all who have voice in academic appointments to these scholars and teachers, and urges that their earlier dismissal not be allowed to stand in the way of their being considered for appointment on the basis of their professional merits.

In Appreciation of Arthur O. Lovejoy

Outstanding among the men responsible for the establishment of the American Association of University Professors and giving it direction was Arthur O. Lovejoy of The Johns Hopkins University. He was one of the first few who recognized the need of a professional organization for all of higher education; who developed the idea, enlisted the interest of others, arranged the organizational meeting, and led the Association through its beginning years, when it had to discover the things it should do. The confidence inspired throughout the profession by Professor Lovejoy and his associates quickly drew into the organization many of the scholars and scientists to whom we look back as among the most illustrious in their respective disciplines. They were glad to recognize Professor Lovejoy as their peer and leader. Together, they endowed the Association with a prestige and influence not accounted for by its relatively small enrollment at the time.

As years passed and the Association increased in size and in the scope of its activities, and as there developed the necessity for full-time professional direction, Professor Lovejoy's leadership expressed itself through the role of wise counselor, and his person acquired almost a symbolic quality, embodying that continuity of purposes and ideals which is one of the Association's most striking characteristics. But he has not been content to be merely an echo of the past; he has maintained a lively interest in professional problems, and on occasion has given vigorous expression of his views.

Today, at the age of eighty-three, he is the Association's strongest living link with its beginnings, its inspiration for the present, and its guarantee of a future which it can face with confidence while it holds to the things he symbolizes. The members of the Association, assembled in the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting at Denver, Colorado, on this, the twenty-sixth of April, 1958, have Arthur O. Lovejoy freshly in their minds. They send him greetings and warm regards, and their wish that he may long continue as the focus of their reverence and affection.

In Appreciation of the Work of the Last Three General Secretaries

In the history of the American Association of University Professors, the modern era began at Gatlinburg and continued through Saint Louis,

New York, and Denver—Gatlinburg with frustration and determination; Saint Louis with soul-searching and action; New York with a new-found unity; and Denver, if not at the summit, at least on a higher plane. In this relatively short period, the Association, through its Special Committee, disposed of the backlog of case work. It revitalized Committee A, activated chapters and conferences, enlarged the Central Office, brightened the *Bulletin*, drew up a new constitution, and redoubled its efforts for the economic advancement of the profession. These have been exciting and rewarding times.

On the score card for these three and a fraction years, the most prominent entry reads, "Shannon to Fuchs to Carr." These three men in succession carried the responsibility of the General Secretaryship and gave the dynamic leadership that the Association most needed.

Before coming to this key office, each had served the Association ably as Council member, as active participant in committee work, and as stalwart individual. Each had a particular talent or a set of talents; all proved themselves arsenals of wisdom, dedication, and inspiration. One has already set a good example by retiring from the General Secretaryship into the active role of legal counsel for the Association. Another promises to move no farther than the chairmanship of Committee A. The third, we are sure, will continue to have the Association on his mind and on his agenda.

Thus it is for great services rendered and to come that the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors extends this gesture of congratulations and heartfelt thanks to those of its most prized executives and members: George Pope Shannon, Ralph F. Fuchs, and Robert K. Carr.

In Appreciation of Helen C. White

Reviewing the past twenty-four months, we are aware of the benefits, too many to enumerate, that have come to the American Association of University Professors by reason of the combination of qualities and skills that can be summed up in the presiding genius of Helen C. White. On behalf of the entire membership of the Association, the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting takes this opportunity to express its thanks.

In Appreciation of Provisions for the Annual Meeting

To the management and staff of the Cosmopolitan Hotel, to our Colorado hosts on the Committee on Local Arrangements, to the hard-working delegation from the Washington Office, and to all others who have contributed to its success, the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors expresses its sincere appreciation and gratitude.

Academic Retirement and Insurance Programs

Foreword

The following Report and Statement of Principles on Academic Retirement and Insurance Programs was prepared by a joint committee representing the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors. It replaces the 1950 Statement of Principles on Academic Retirement and Related Subjects. The committee members from the Association of American Colleges were Philip Milo Bail (President, Municipal University of Omaha), Douglas J. Brown (Provost, Princeton University), Charles S. Casassa, S.J. (President, Loyola University of Los Angeles), Theodore A. Distler (Executive Director, Association of American Colleges), Luther H. Foster (President, Tuskegee Institute), Perry E. Gresham (President, Bethany College), Mark H. Ingraham (Dean, College of Letters and Science, University of Wisconsin), Walter C. Langsam (President, University of Cincinnati), R. McAllister Lloyd (Chairman of the Board, Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association), John A. Morrison (President, Anderson College). The committee members from the American Association of University Professors were Professors Homer C. Bishop (Washington University), Ralph F. Fuchs (Indiana University), Philip Taft (Brown University), Marian M. Torrey (Goucher College), and Helen C. White (University of Wisconsin).

The Statement of Principles was approved by the Association of American Colleges at its Annual Meeting in January, 1958. It was approved by the Council of the American Association of University Professors and was endorsed by the Association's Forty-fourth Annual Meeting in April, 1958.

Committee Report

In 1950, a Joint Committee of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges reported to their associations on "Academic Retirement and Related Subjects." This report consisted of a moderately long discussion of many topics related to retirement and a short "Statement of Principles," largely explained

in the preceding discussion. This Statement of Principles was adopted with minor modifications by the two associations.

During the last year or two, it became apparent that it would be wise to review this Statement of Principles and to take cognizance of certain developments in the areas of insurance and other staff benefits that have taken place in the last eight years. A new report is therefore submitted to our Associations.

This report likewise is divided into a general discussion and a Statement of Principles. The Statement of Principles includes a few modifications of the report of 1950 and several important additions. The preliminary discussion does not review the ground covered by the report of 1950 but only discusses the modifications in the Statement of Principles and the additions thereto.

Retirement

The chief modifications in the Statement regarding retirement are to take account of the fact that most institutions have brought their faculties under Social Security, to delete references to interest rates which are no longer applicable, and to indicate that under certain conditions the recall of retired teachers on part time after a fixed retirement age may be acceptable practice. In addition, recommendations are made that institutions' insurance programs for their faculties include life insurance on a group basis, major medical (catastrophic) insurance, and disability insurance.

Since 1950, the large majority of faculty members in private institutions have come under Social Security. The faculty members in many public institutions already have Social Security coverage and others are in the process of getting such coverage. This had been recommended by the Committee in 1950 and we are glad to see that the movement has taken place rapidly. This has made it less difficult to attain the goal of "50% of the average salary over the last 10 years of service," set up in the 1950 Report. It would not seem to this committee wise to set a higher minimum goal, although we are happy to note that many institutions have annuity programs which in most cases will provide an annuity in excess of this figure. The Statement of Principles has been changed, therefore, to make it clear that we are not assuming that Social Security be in addition to the previous goal.

The 1950 goal has since been modified by action of our two Associations to make it read, "to provide under normal circumstances and in so far as possible for a retirement life annuity equivalent in purchasing power" to approximately 50% of the last ten-year average salary. Hence the Statement on Retirement now recognizes the desirability of the variable annuity, reflecting changes in the price level, as resourcefully pro-

vided by the College Retirement Equities Fund. The Statement ought by all means to continue to reflect this substantial advance in the provision of economic security for retirement.

The 1950 Report contained the statement: "Conditions such as longevity, health of the profession, and interest rates have recently changed in such a way as to justify older rather than younger retirement ages." As far as interest rates go, this statement is no longer applicable, since they have risen markedly since 1950. On the other hand, there are other factors that have come into the picture that would justify older rather than younger retirement ages—particularly the shortage of teachers in the light of increasing enrollments.

Finally, the committee did not believe that the Associations should take as strong a stand against continued service after retirement age as that of the 1950 Statement. In spite of the cogent arguments of the 1950 Report for a fixed retirement age, the committee believes that universities should be in a position to use a system of recall for staff members so that their services on a part-time basis may be extended beyond a fixed retirement age. No plan which provides administrative discretion on such a matter will avoid the embarrassment entailed in choices among various faculty members, all of whom have given long and good service to an institution. However, the desirability of prolonging the individual's service to society as long as he is effective, especially in a period of shortages in "brain power," seems to us more important than avoiding administrative embarrassment and hurt feelings.

One of the strong arguments for a fixed retirement age is that it makes certain that the younger men in the department will not have their freedom of action curtailed indefinitely by the continued service of their seniors. A system of recall for specific services, without vote in departmental or faculty matters and without continuance in certain administrative positions, such as departmental chairmanships or chairmanships of major committees, to a large extent avoids this difficulty. A number of institutions have already experimented successfully with the plan of "recall." In order, however, for such a plan to be successful, it should not be assumed that it is a privilege of the faculty member to continue on part time past retirement, even when he is in good mental or physical health. In addition to these necessary requirements, the need for his services should be clear. Moreover, the later a retirement age at an institution, the less frequently will it be desirable to recall an individual for service past the regular retirement age. Recommendation 4 of the Statement of Principles, if approved, will indicate that our Associations recognize the value of a system of recall under carefully guarded conditions.

Your committee is particularly happy to note that a grant to the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges has been made by the Ford Foundation to establish a roster of retired teachers so that institutions other than those from which they are retiring will know of their availability for teaching.

Your committee saw no particular reason why it should recommend that death benefits to beneficiaries other than widows should normally be paid in cash. It does not wish to take a stand in this matter.

Other changes in the Statement in regard to retirement systems and retirement annuities are minor and their reasons, we believe, obvious.

Life Insurance on a Group Basis

In 1950, the committee recommended that institutions study the opportunities of collective and group life insurance. It now brings before the Associations for their approval a definite recommendation in this regard. Under certain conditions, Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance provides substantial benefits which are totally lacking, however, under other conditions. The widow while under age 62, without minor children, receives practically no survivorship benefits. Life insurance on a group basis has several advantages: (a) In general, it is cheaper than individual insurance; (b) it may be secured by those who could not pass the medical examination of the life insurance company; (c) it guarantees to the institution that all its staff are covered, so that the problems of destitute survivors do not embarrass the institution or tempt it to place on the payroll persons whom it might not otherwise employ. There are, therefore, advantages both to the institution and to the individual in life insurance on a group basis. Life insurance on a group basis should be planned in coordination with the death benefits afforded by the retirement system. These death benefits normally increase with the length of the faculty member's employment, and hence it may well be that group insurance benefits might remain the same or even decrease as the faculty member grows older. The plan for decreasing collective life insurance that the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association (TIAA) has developed is one that dovetails well with many retirement systems.

In particular, care should be taken that any contributions of individual faculty members be equitably distributed, since many types of life insurance on a group basis now in practice charge a greater share of the cost to the younger person than to the older. At times, the contribution by the younger person is more than the actual premium charged by the insurance company for his protection. This, in our opinion, is undesirable.

Insurance for Medical Expenses

A person insures himself against loss of his house through fire. He does not insure himself against having his washers changed in the faucet. Insurance is meant to provide for large, unpredictable expenses which would be impossible, or at least highly inconvenient, to meet without the aid of insurance. There is, therefore, a subjective factor, varying with circumstances, in what a person should be insured for and what risks he should carry himself. This consideration is particularly applicable to medical insurance. There are many faculty members, especially in the younger group, who find even moderate unexpected medical expenses financially significant. The forms of hospital and surgical insurance which have become common (for instance, Blue Cross and Blue Shield) are an aid to these persons. In addition, such plans provide a useful means of regularized payment for the services covered. Moreover, insurance on a group basis in medical matters is much cheaper than on an individual basis. Hence it is desirable for an institution to arrange that all of its staff have such insurance, or an opportunity to secure it.

However, of considerably greater importance is insurance against major medical expense—the so-called "catastrophic" insurance. Whereas many faculty members may be inconvenienced financially for only a short period by a tonsils operation or a broken nose, few indeed can meet without serious hardship the expenses of a prolonged period in the hospital with large hospital and surgery costs. The average group medical insurance plan has upper limits to the expenses paid of such a restrictive nature that little help toward meeting major medical costs is derived from these policies. The development for groups, such as faculties, of major medical insurance on a group basis has been a great need. The TIAA, with the backing of a grant from the Ford Foundation, has now made this form of insurance available on a basis which provides for meeting approximately four fifths of these expenses above a fixed minimum for which no protection is afforded. This arrangement is similar to automobile collision insurance with, say, $100 deductible. The cost of such insurance is not great since, although to the few people having to meet such major medical expenses the effect is catastrophic, for a large group the total amount of such expenses is much less than the total amount paid for short or minor illnesses. There are several insurance companies, besides the TIAA, which have relatively good plans for major medical expenses.

Disability Insurance

Preparation for college teaching and research is long and expensive. The individual's and the community's investments in the training of a scholar are very considerable. His remuneration starts late and, to put it mildly, is not excessive. There are few things, therefore, that the

scholar has more reason to fear than the possibility of being disabled from carrying on the profession in preparing for which he has invested so much time and energy. Disability of the scholar before retirement is rare—but when it occurs it is a catastrophic calamity.

A plan in which half-salary up to retirement age will be paid during long-time disability, whether it is presumed to be permanent or not, and which meanwhile will provide for contributions toward a retirement annuity at the time the faculty member reaches retirement age, would be a great benefit both to the individual and to the institution. The benefit to the institution grows out of the tendency, which is now quite prevalent, to provide a substantial settlement or a continuing subsidy for nominal work to a disabled faculty member, with resulting embarrassment to the individual, and detriment to the institutional budget or to colleagues who carry an increased work load. A good disability insurance plan would take care of such situations in a much more desirable way.

In the past, there has been no disability plan available for institutions to cover their staffs in a way that meets both institutional and individual needs, taking account of retirement plans. Disability insurance meeting these needs has now been introduced through TIAA with the backing of a grant from the Ford Foundation. This insurance is also of the deductible type, in which short-time disability is not covered, but in which there is no limit to the coverage for long disability.

New TIAA Study

Your committee is happy to learn that the TIAA is planning to make a new factual study of retirement policies and insurance benefits available in colleges and universities throughout the country. The resulting report will bring up to date the extremely useful book on college retirement plans, the first edition of which was prepared by Rainard B. Robbins and the second by William C. Greenough. The committee believes such an enlarged and up-to-date study will be of great value to the profession.

The Committee recommends that the following statement of principles be endorsed by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges.

Statement of Principles

Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or administrator, or even of the individual institution. The policy of an institution for the retirement of faculty members and administrators and its plan for their insurance benefits and retirement annuities should be such as to increase the effectiveness of its services as an educational agency. Spe-

cifically, this policy and plan should be such as to attract individuals of the highest abilities to educational work, to sustain the morale of the faculty, to permit faculty members with singleness of purpose to devote their energies to serving their institution, and to make it possible in a socially acceptable manner to discontinue the services of members of the faculty when their usefulness is undermined by age.

The following is recommended practice:

1. The retirement policy and annuity plan of an institution, as well as its insurance program, should be clearly defined and be well understood by both the faculty and the administration of the institution.

2. The institution should have a fixed and relatively late retirement age, the same for teachers and administrators. The length of training of college teachers, their longevity and their health generally are such that in the present circumstances the desirable fixed retirement age would appear to be from sixty-seven to seventy.

3. Circumstances that may seem to justify the involuntary retirement of a teacher or administrator before the fixed retirement age should in all cases be considered by a joint faculty-administrative committee of the institution. This committee should preferably be a standing committee, but in the consideration of specific cases, no interested person should be permitted to participate in its deliberations. (The above is not meant to indicate that the involuntary return of an administrator to teaching duties need be regarded as a retirement.)

4. The recall of teachers on retired status should be without tenure and on an annual appointment. Such recall should be used only where the services are clearly needed and where the individual is in good mental and physical health. It may be for part or for full time. Such recall should be rare where the retirement age is as late as 70.

5. The institution should provide for a system of retirement annuities. Such a system should:

(a) Be financed by contributions made during the period of active service by both the individual and the institution.

(b) Be participated in by all full-time faculty members who have attained a certain fixed age, not later than 30.

(c) Be planned to provide in normal circumstances and in so far as possible for a retirement life annuity (including Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance benefits) equivalent in purchasing power to approximately 50% of the average salary over the last 10 years of service if the retirement is at 70, and a somewhat higher percentage if the fixed retirement age is younger.

(d) Ensure that the full amount of the individual's and the institution's contribution, with the accumulations thereon, be vested in the indi-

vidual, available as a benefit in case of death while in service, and with no forfeiture in case of withdrawal or dismissal from the institution.

(e) Be such that the individual may not withdraw his equity in cash but only in the form of an annuity. (To avoid administrative expense, exception might be made for very small accumulations in an inactive account.) Except when they are small, death benefits to a widow should be paid in the form of an annuity.

6. When a new retirement policy or annuity plan is initiated or an old one changed, reasonable provision either by special financial arrangements or by the gradual inauguration of the new plan should be made for those adversely affected.

7. It is desirable for the insurance program of an institution to include the following:

(a) Life insurance on a group basis, in addition to survivors' benefits under Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance.

(b) Insurance for medical expenses, including major medical (catastrophic) insurance.

(c) Disability insurance, covering long-term total disability for any occupation for which the staff member is reasonably fitted, and paying half-salary up to a reasonable maximum during disability before retirement as well as continuing contributions toward a retirement annuity.

Scholar's Choler

Infra, ibid., vide, viz.:
I chase each reference till I'm diz-
Zy down the restless page, then fall
With *ante, post, passim, et al.*

When every thought's commented on,
To read's a weary marathon.
At footnotes faltering, I concede
The bookworm should turn centipede.

Jane Goddard

Altadena, California

Educational Developments

Economic Status

Comprehensive Study of Faculty Salaries for 1957–58

On March 4, 1958, the United States Office of Education released perhaps the most comprehensive report on current faculty salaries ever made public. This report, entitled "Higher Education Planning and Management Data, 1957–58," and based on replies from 1,146 colleges and universities, contains 102 pages, including 27 tables of salary data, arranged by types, sizes, and geographic locations of institutions. It also furnishes useful information on faculty fringe benefits and on tuition, fees, and charges for room and board. The study finds that the average salary for college faculty members of all ranks was $6120 at the time the data were compiled. The *New York Times*, in an editorial commenting on the report, remarks that this is just about what plumbers get in wages—which is, of course, no reflection on plumbers—and adds: "But such is the value that this country places on the services of those who, as Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Folsom says, 'are key members of our society' and who train most of the future leaders in all walks of life."

The facing table of average salaries for four types of institutions contains information accumulated from approximately 500 institutions. (Printed by permission of the compiler of the report, Mr. W. Robert Bokelman, specialist in college business management for the Office of Education.)

Copies of the salary report (Circular No. 517) may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at 60 cents each. A check or money order should be sent with each order.

Developments at Columbia University

In January of 1958, a faculty self-study committee, financed by the Carnegie Corporation, issued a report looking to the future of Columbia University. The committee included among its recommendations that the University spend at least $100,000,000 in the near future on necessary buildings, increases in faculty salaries, a three-fold increase in fellowship and scholarship funds, and other needs. In recommending tuition increases to support higher faculty salaries, the report cautioned that part of the increased tuition should be applied to new scholarships and fellowships. It recommended that faculty members receive a 10% discount on rent in the apartment houses owned by the University. It pointed out that several universities pay higher average salaries in each rank than does Columbia, and that in consequence the University can expect increasing difficulty in recruiting new teachers and in keeping outstanding teachers now on the faculty.

Dr. Grayson Kirk, President of the University, in a news release, agreed that faculty salaries at Columbia, as elsewhere, should be doubled as soon as

SALARY DATA FOR FACULTY MEMBERS EMPLOYED NO MORE THAN 10 MONTHS, BY CONTROL, 1957–58
(Figures in parentheses indicate numbers of institutions reporting)

Data classifications by academic rank	*Public*		*Private*	
	Universities (54)	*Teachers Colleges (93)*	*Universities (39)*	*Liberal Arts Colleges (326)*
Professors				
Maximum mean salary	$12,350	$9,250	$13,850	$10,850
Third quartile mean salary	10,060	8,290	9,730	7,400
Median mean salary	8,680	7,440	8,510	6,290
First quartile mean salary	7,440	6,660	7,800	5,500
Minimum mean salary	5,750	4,850	5,150	2,550
Mean salary	8,940	7,440	8,860	6,540
Associate professors				
Maximum mean salary	9,450	7,950	9,050	8,050
Third quartile mean salary	7,540	7,030	7,190	6,000
Median mean salary	6,840	6,700	6,570	5,380
First quartile mean salary	6,280	5,790	6,210	4,690
Minimum mean salary	4,950	4,150	4,850	2,550
Mean salary	6,980	6,430	6,660	5,440
Assistant professors				
Maximum mean salary	8,050	7,250	6,550	6,450
Third quartile mean salary	6,240	6,090	5,730	5,180
Median mean salary	5,790	5,890	5,580	4,840
First quartile mean salary	5,460	5,250	5,360	4,360
Minimum mean salary	4,250	3,550	4,250	2,250
Mean salary	5,850	5,660	5,490	4,760
Instructors				
Maximum mean salary	6,550	7,050	5,150	5,550
Third quartile mean salary	5,100	5,290	4,770	4,480
Median mean salary	4,700	4,860	4,600	4,220
First quartile mean salary	4,410	4,470	4,410	3,860
Minimum mean salary	3,450	3,150	3,550	1,250
Mean salary	4,780	4,880	4,520	4,110

possible. He announced the present salary schedule: professor, minimum $10,000 with an indeterminate maximum; associate professor, $6500 to $10,000; assistant professor, $5500 to $7000; and instructor, $4500 to $6000.

The Columbia University chapter of the American Association of University Professors circulated an "Open Letter to the President and Trustees of Columbia University," pointing out the difficulties of recruitment and retention of present faculty, and making the following recommendations: (a) Columbia University should achieve and maintain the highest median salary for full professors in the United States; (b) the University's salaries for associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors should be fully competitive with comparable institutions. Faculty signatures were solicited for presentation to the President and Trustees.

St. Joseph's College Announces New Salary Schedule

St. Joseph's College (Collegeville, Ind.) has announced the following salary schedule, to become effective for the year 1958–59: professor, $9000 to $15,000; associate professor, $7000 to $9500; assistant professor, $6000 to $8500; instructor, $5000 to $7500. The new schedule represents an average salary increase of about $1500 a year. It is the second increase in two years, and represents an average increase of about 100% since the college received the Ford Foundation grant. The College claims that the new schedule is, "as

far as we know, the best in any Catholic college in the United States." In addition, the College recently began financing a faculty community to enable its teachers to build their own homes under terms which they can afford. By September, 1958, it is expected that there will be about 30 lay faculty members and a student enrollment of 1050.

Salary Ranges and Benefits at Union College, Schenectady, New York

Union College reports that the salary ranges in effect for the year 1957–58 are: professor, $6800 to $12,000 (median, $7800); associate professor, $5500 to $7000 (median, $6200); assistant professor, $4800 to $6300 (median, $5500); and instructor, $4200 to $5200 (median, $5000). In addition, the following fringe benefits are in force for all full-time members of the faculty: (a) a TIAA annuity plan to which the faculty member contributes 7% of his total salary and the College contributes 8%; and (b) payment by the College of all premiums for the following types of TIAA insurance: major medical, disability, and five units of term life insurance.

Midwestern State University Salaries and Wage-Labor Rates

On January 19, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* published an article discussing the needs of the University of Missouri. Among much material of interest especially to citizens of Missouri were some items of general interest. Average salaries for each rank had been obtained from the following Midwestern state universities: Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio State, and Wisconsin. Average salaries for the four ranks among these 11 universities were: professor, maximum $11,720, minimum $8068; associate professor, maximum $8290, minimum $6567; assistant professor, maximum $6580, minimum $5507; instructor, maximum $5298, minimum $4067. The *Post-Dispatch* commented, in regard to the averages at the University of Missouri, "Assuming a 48-hour work week, although most teachers work much longer, the hourly rate of pay for professors on a nine month basis would be $4.53; associate professors, $3.56; assistant professors, $2.95; and instructors, $2.17. By comparison, St. Louis labor scales include: plumber, superintendent, $4.30; bricklayer, foreman, $4; carpenter, foreman, $3.65; carpenter, $3.25; boilermaker's helper, $3.10; hod carrier, $2.75; and laborer, $2.30."

Average Salaries and Biennial Increase at the University of Iowa

As a result of action by the Iowa State Legislature, funds for salary increases for the faculty of the State University of Iowa were made available for the year beginning July 1, 1957. The average salary within each rank for the year 1957–58, with the percentage increase over the average of the preceding biennium, for faculty members teaching on a 9 month basis, is as follows: professor, $9411, 18.4%; associate professor, $7184, 12.4%; assistant professor, $5930, 12.5%; instructor, $4499, 12.5%. For faculty members on a 12 month basis, the averages and increases are: professor, $11,235, 16.1%; associate professor, $9015, 22.9%; assistant professor, $7531, 18.1%; instructor, $5576, 20.5%.

Developments at Tulane University

Tulane University has announced that it received $1,154,622 in unrestricted funds as a result of its 1957 Annual Fund Program. This fund "is

applied directly to the Tulane educational program for faculty salaries, student aid, and libraries." The divisions of the Fund and the amounts received by each in 1957 are: alumni, $264,788; associates, $531,684; foundations, $275,495; parents, $10,382; miscellaneous, $72,273.

Tulane has recently announced a campaign to raise $96,000,000 in the next ten years for the improvement of the University. The needs are carefully stated in detail, and $50,000,000 of the total is to be added to the general endowment of the University so that faculty salaries can be raised.

The Tulane University chapter of the American Association of University Professors recently published a study of faculty salaries at the University, made by a committee whose chairman was Professor Warren Breed. The study comprises 5 tables and 10 pages of analysis and comment. It is not only descriptive and comparative of salaries received, but goes into budget needs, such as housing, savings, indebtedness, medical, professional, and cultural expenses, and expenses for the education of children; and into income from outside work and work done by wives of faculty members.

Gifts to Colleges Reach New High

The figures belie the often heard statement that the days of large private benefactions to higher education in the United States are past. A survey of gifts and bequests in 1956–57 to 50 colleges and universities (42 privately and 8 publicly supported), made public by the John Price Jones Company, a fund-raising organization, in February, 1958, showed that these institutions had received $272,734,000 in gifts and bequests from private sources. This was a gain of 30.3% over the previous year's high of $209,274,000. In the past 37 years, the 50 institutions have been given $2,705,440,000 by private philanthropy, and of this total, $1,106,188,000 has been received since 1950–51. The following institutions received contributions in excess of $15,000,000 in 1956–57: Harvard, Yale, Stanford, Columbia, Chicago, Cornell, and Johns Hopkins. Among the women's colleges, Bryn Mawr and Wellesley were highest.

According to an estimate presented by Mr. Eger V. Murphree, President of the Esso Research and Engineering Company, at a forum sponsored, in April, 1958, by the American Management Association, corporations gave $150,000,000 to education in 1957—substantially more than in 1956, for which year estimates ranged from $100,000,000 to $125,000,000.

Potpourri

The University of Notre Dame's $66,600,000 development program over the next ten years includes $27,000,000 in endowment for increased faculty salaries. . . . Wellesley College announced in February that it had collected $1,141,667 in the first five months of its campaign to raise $15,000,000 as endowment to increase faculty salaries. . . . The will of Frank L. Miller, Jr., an alumnus of Princeton University who died in Chattanooga on January 27, 1958, allotted $200,000 to Princeton. . . . Lafayette College has received a gift of $6,000,000 from the Marquis Foundation. In the last five years, the Foundation has made substantial gifts to the College. These have been used to increase faculty salaries. . . . Radcliffe College has received $2,515,091 in gifts and pledges toward a ten-year plan of development. The goal is $10,000,000. . . . Mr. Paul Moore, of Convent Station, N. J., a 1908 graduate, has given to Yale University $100,000 to be used as it sees fit "in strengthening the freshman year." . . . The Cornell University Law School has announced that it has received a gift of $1,000,000 from Mr. Myron C.

Taylor, a member of the class of 1894. . . . Cornell University announced in March that it had received a gift of $250,000 from Mr. Walter S. Carpenter, Jr., of Wilmington, Delaware, as an endowment for the new engineering library. . . . Colby College reports that $768,008.12 was secured in advance gifts and pledges before the opening, in April, of the $2,500,000 Colby College Fulfillment Program. . . . Georgetown University raised $143,161 in its 1957 Alumni Giving Fund. This was an increase of $24,500 over 1956. . . . A bequest of $250,000 from the estate of William J. Gallon has been received by Hofstra College. . . . Mr. Leroy R. Grumman, Board Chairman of the Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corporation, has donated $500,000 to Cornell University to be used toward a building for the Graduate School of Aeronautical Engineering. . . . As a result of a gift of more than $100,000 in honor of Dr. Theodore H. Jack, President Emeritus of Randolph-Macon Woman's College, a chair in history has been endowed in his name. . . . The Ford Foundation has announced that it will grant $340,000 to Vanderbilt University's School of Law to strengthen its program in law and contemporary affairs. . . . A grant of $100,000 for the support of the College library has been made to Middlebury College by the Irene Heinz Given and John La Porte Given Foundation of New York City. . . . Tuition at the University of Buffalo will rise from $700 to $780 a year for freshmen and sophomores and $880 a year for juniors and seniors next September. . . . A plan to enable the public school teachers of Winnetka, Ill. to earn up to $12,000 a year plus fringe benefits comparable to those in industry has been offered in a heavily documented 73-page report of a citizens' committee named by the board of education and headed by James C. Worthy, former Assistant Secretary of Commerce and a vice-president of Sears Roebuck & Co. . . . Cornell University has been left $100,000 from the estate of William Weinberg. . . . Eighty-two part-time students at Tufts University College of Engineering have pledged 50 cents a week for four years in support of the institution's $1,500,000 building drive. . . . Anne Parrish, the novelist, who died in the fall of 1957, left a bequest of $10,000,000 for the study and treatment of mental and emotional disorders. The work is to be undertaken by the New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center, and as a result the New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center Foundation, Inc., has been organized. . . . One hundred ten private colleges and universities in the State of New York reported to Governor Harriman last February that they could provide space for 75,000 additional students by 1970, and that they expected that to do so would require the expenditure of about $450,000,000. . . . The University of Connecticut salary schedule is as follows: professor, $7980 to $11,940; associate professor, $6900 to $10,140; assistant professor, $5940 to $8580; instructor, $4980 to $7140. By faculty preference, intra-rank increases are made on the basis of merit rather than automatically. . . . Beginning September, 1958, new students at Harvard may, for a $10 fee, budget their term bills, including tuition, by the month; and scholarship and loan funds will be increased by $500,000. . . . In a *Report on the American Economy*, issued in April by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the prediction is made that, to cope with increased enrollments, a lengthened average period of schooling, and the problem of maintaining a supply of qualified teachers, this country will probably have to double, by 1967, the $13 billion spent for education in 1957.

Organizational Notes

Activities of Staff, Officers, and Association Representatives

On February 13, in Washington, Mr. Carr attended a conference of the Council for Financial Aid to Education on plans to better television participation in the national advertising campaign for higher education. On March 18, he was a consultant at a conference of the Committee on the Relationships of Higher Education to the Federal Government, held in Washington under the auspices of the American Council on Education. On March 20, he participated in the Washington Program of Colombian Rectors, sponsored by the Committee on Leaders and Specialists. He was a panelist on the Workshop for Religious Liberals conducted by the Unitarian Committee of Social Justice at All Souls Unitarian Church in Washington on March 11. He was guest speaker at a meeting of the Ohio Conference of the Association, held at Muskingum College on March 15, and at a meeting of the Virginia State Conference in Richmond on March 22. On April 2, he addressed the National Civil Liberties Clearing House, in Washington, on the subject, "The Outlook for Intellectual Freedom," and on April 8, he spoke to the Washington Higher Education Group on current trends in academic freedom. On April 11, he addressed a dinner meeting of the Hood College chapter of the Association, and on April 18, a meeting of the University of New Hampshire chapter.

Immediately after the Annual Meeting in Denver, Mr. Carr journeyed to the West Coast, where he visited the Stanford University chapter on April 29, the Willamette University chapter on May 1, and the University of Washington chapter on May 2. On May 3, he addressed a meeting of the Pacific Northwest Region at Moscow, Idaho, and on May 5, a meeting of the University of Minnesota chapter in Minneapolis.

Mr. Shannon was guest speaker at the organizational meeting of the Monmouth College (N.J.) chapter on March 28. Other guests at the meeting included Professor Arthur H. Scouten (University of Pennsylvania), member of Committee E, and representatives of other New Jersey chapters. On March 17, Mr. Fidler was the speaker at a meeting of the Gallaudet College chapter, and on April 29, in Chicago, he addressed meetings of the University of Chicago and Loyola University chapters. On April 30 and May 1, he attended a conference on College Teacher Preparation Programs, sponsored by the American Council on Education. On May 2, he participated in a panel discussion, sponsored by the Temple University chapter, on Faculty-Administration Relationships. Mr. Davis spoke at a meeting of the District of Columbia Conference on March 6. All members of the Washington office staff attended sessions of the Ninth Annual Conference of the National Civil Liberties Clearing House, in Washington, on March 6 and 7.

On February 14, Professor John Q. Hays (Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas), a member of the Council, spoke at a meeting of the Navarro Junior College chapter; on February 18, Professor James C. Carey (Kansas State College), a member of Committee E, spoke at a meeting of the Central

Missouri State College chapter; and on February 26, Professor David C. Murdoch (University of British Columbia), a member of the Council, spoke at a meeting of the Western Washington College of Education chapter. Professor Henry H. H. Remak (Indiana University), of Committee E, was guest of the Kentucky Conference at its meeting in Lexington on April 6.

During recent months, a number of members have represented the Association at the inauguration of college and university presidents: Professor Jack Purdue (Oklahoma Baptist University) at the inauguration of Dr. Jack Stauffer Wilkes as President of Oklahoma City University on March 6; Professor Earle F. Berg (Queens College, N. C.) at the inauguration of Dr. Rufus Patterson Perry as President of Johnson C. Smith University on April 7; Professor Clyde I. Lewis (Eastern Kentucky State College) at the inauguration of Dr. Irvin E. Lunger as President of Transylvania College on April 15; Professor Malcolm W. Oliphant (Georgetown University) at the inauguration of Dr. William Joseph McDonald as Rector of the Catholic University of America on April 16; Professor Ruth Mohl (Brooklyn College) at the inauguration of Dr. Ernst Weber as President of the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn on April 19; and Professor Margaret E. Lyon (Mills College) at the inauguration of Dr. Glenn S. Dumke as President of San Francisco State College on May 2.

Dr. Elizabeth Schneider (Temple University) and Professor Donald Flaherty (Dickinson College) were the Association's delegates at the Sixty-ninth Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Political Science, held in Philadelphia on April 11 and 12.

New Chapters

Chapters of the Association have recently been established at the following institutions: Delaware State College, Henry Ford Community College, High Point College, University of Houston, Huron College, Monmouth College (N.J.), Stevens Institute of Technology, and Texas Western College. In addition, the former chapter at Southern University has been reactivated.

Additional Committee Assignments

Committee E on the Establishment and Conduct of Chapters
District I: Eugene K. Chamberlin (History), San Diego Junior College.

Editor's Notes

Annual Meeting

We are pleased to report that the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting at Denver was one of the Association's better meetings—or so it seemed to us, perhaps because there was a minimum of oratory holding the Central Office accountable for all the ills that plague the academic profession. Even the most obstreperous are inclined to grant a sort of honeymoon, armistice, or Truce of God to a newly appointed General Secretary, and neither of the two most recent appointees was in office long enough to encounter serious criticism.

Cynicism is an unattractive quality; so let us hasten to add that the comparative absence of ill-natured criticism at Denver (there was some) should also be attributed to the ability of the two most recent General Secretaries themselves to communicate a feeling that the Association is on the move and doing things—a feeling substantially nourished by reports published and censures imposed in the past three years, and by the Association's numerous manifestations of interest in the economic status of the profession. Since these and other activities have been instigated and vigorously supported by Ralph F. Fuchs and Robert K. Carr, it would be false to regard them as merely, or even primarily, the beneficiaries of a passing kindliness; each has done much to establish orderly and amicable intercourse between the membership and the national organization.

However, the honeymoon principle is a factor, and Dr. Fidler, whose appointment as General Secretary, effective September 1, is noted elsewhere (page 391), will also, we trust, receive his due of initial kindness while he is proving, as he presently will, his title to the leadership entrusted to him. Any frank appraisal of the situation must state that in the past three years the Association has started more than it has finished, and has posed more problems than it has solved. The new General Secretary, the Council, and the Association as a whole will be wrestling with knotty problems, which will not be eased by recriminations.

To return to the Annual Meeting, a gratifying feature was the attendance, which was especially good considering the distance travelled by most persons present. This was the first time the Association had met so far west, and the expense to the national organization, as well as to some chapters and individual members, was considerable. However, this location enabled some to attend who could not have gone farther east, and there was merit in giving physical recognition to the fact that the Association has a large and valued membership west of the Mississippi.

The resolutions adopted, and the actions taken on Committee A recommendations, with a few other items, are given elsewhere in this issue. A fuller account, and a report on the Council Meeting, will appear in September.

Liberal Stereotype

The Annual Meeting approved a resolution on education (page 503 of this issue), but first approved an amendment deleting the following sentence, which was in the resolution as originally presented:

[The Meeting] also warns against the assumption that an educational system that is highly esteemed in a foreign country will necessarily produce desirable results here—especially that a system reputed to be successful in a totalitarian society will be serviceable in advancing the interests of a democratic society.

The objections were not stated with great clarity, but some comments from the floor seemed to reveal an apprehension that the sentence was xenophobic in motivation and warmongering in effect. We happen to be personally acquainted with the man who drafted the resolution; we will avouch that he does not write "dirtyforeigner" as a single word, and he has not stumped for preventive war against the Russians. We think he was merely trying to say that "it ain't necessarily so" that we should blindly imitate an educational system simply because it has out-sputniked us. He had in mind, we feel sure, the attitude satirized in a recent *New Yorker* cartoon, in which a character at a town meeting shouts: "Classrooms! Classrooms! Do the Russians worry about classrooms?" Still more recently, Little Orphan Annie, when informed that Daddy Warbucks' extremely youthful scientists were "from foreign lands," asked, "Y'mean foreigners are smarter'n we are?" Punjab explained: "Perhaps they study harder and to more purpose. Many speak three languages. Most are far advanced in mathematics, chemistry, biology. Very few, however, know much of finger painting, or cooking, or bop." The author of the resolution, we surmise, thought that the Meeting ought to say something about this sudden revival of "The Russians do these things better." In his innocence he did not know that with *foreign* he ran afoul of one of the "trigger words" of cliché-riding liberals. As for ourselves, we shall try to keep "foreign" out of this column, lest we be accused of "chauvinism"—another liberal cliché.

"Musical Chairs" Repaired

The second paragraph of "Musical Chairs" (Spring, No. 1A, p. 314) was intended to conclude: "A committee of two alumni, two students, and three faculty members turned to to find another coach"—yes, two *to's* in succession. The printer won, however; one of the *to's* was omitted, to the ruination of our syntax. We managed, not without effort, to hold on to *misliking* in the first paragraph (the printer wanted *dis-*), but two *to's* were too many.

When we retire, we are going to buy a hand press and print the English language the way we want to, *procedurally*, subject only to such *substantive* censorship as exists around Gantt Pond, Alabama, where we shall reside.

Permissions and Notices

"Writer's Magic," by A. Grove Day (Summer, 1947), to be mimeographed for distribution to graduate students and others.

"Education by Façade," by Walter Houston Clark (Winter, 1952), excerpt to be quoted in a book published by the Southern Illinois University Press.

"Voluntary Action in a Democracy," by Agnes E. Meyer (Spring, 1955), to be mimeographed for distribution to social science classes.

"Ph. Dear," by Dorothy Ballard (Spring, 1956), to be reprinted in *Chemical Literature*, a publication of the Armour Research Foundation.

"Scholarly Style or the Lack Thereof," by Sheridan Baker (Autumn, 1956), mimeographed for the use of graduate students.

"Town and Gown," by Philip Appleman (Summer, 1957), to be reprinted in the *Newsletter* of the Association of Urban Universities.

"Sabbatical Leave Travel Expenses and the Federal Income Tax," by William W. Oliver (Autumn, 1957), to be mimeographed for the use of a university faculty.

"Faculty Salaries," by Seymour E. Harris (Winter, 1957), excerpt to be reproduced as part of a collection of readings for students in a citizenship course.

"After Sending Freshmen to Describe a Tree," by Robert Hogan (Winter, 1957), to be included as a special feature in a textbook publisher's *Freshman English Review* (a description of first-year textbooks).

Arkansas Experiment in Teacher Education

General Education in the Colleges of Arkansas is the title of a comprehensive survey and commentary, of 156 pages, on the "Arkansas Experiment in Teacher Education," a project sponsored by the Fund for the Advancement of Education. The author is Hoyt Trowbridge, Chairman of the Department of English at the University of New Mexico, who for two years served as consultant to the Experiment. An initial essay on "Forty Years of General Education," and a chapter on "Patterns and Trends" in problems and their solutions concerning the role of general education in teacher training, are followed by separate chapters on programs in science and mathematics, the social studies, and the humanities. Copies can be obtained on request from Arkansas Experiment in Teacher Education, 512 Baptist Medical Arts Building, 12th and Marshall Streets, Little Rock, Ark.

Books for Asian Students

The Asia Foundation urges the members of American college and university faculties to contribute books of educational interest, particularly anthologies, biographies, histories, special studies, and textbooks, to the Books for Asian Students Program, which is administered by the Foundation. For further information, write to The Asia Foundation, 550 Kearney Street, San Francisco 8, Calif.

The Association's Accomplishments

The influence of the Association "in being," and its role in helping to develop "the common law of the academic profession," favorite themes of the late Ralph E. Himstead, are neatly combined in the following passage from a letter recently received from a widely experienced member, who not long ago was active in the composition of two local difficulties:

From my own experience I have been impressed recently with the power exercised by the AAUP merely by its existence—and I don't mean as a threat.

Administrators often want to do the right thing and can be encouraged to do so if there is some guide to faith and practice. In the recent difficulties at the University of ..... (the ..... case), and in ..... University (the ..... case), the advice and counsel received from [members of the Central Office staff] were invaluable, not only to me, but to the administrators involved. As Vice-President ....., of the University of ....., remarked to me during the ..... case, we may be on the way to establishing an "academic law" comparable to the canon law which passing centuries have worked out for ecclesiastical organizations. If we are, the chief enterpriser in the business will be the American Association of University Professors.

Such testimony, and that of Howard Mumford Jones (quoted as a "filler" in the Winter, 1957 *Bulletin*, p. 614), is part of the answer to those who say that the Association "did not do anything" between 1950 and 1956.

Himstead Portrait

Contributions to the Himstead Portrait Fund (*Bulletin*, Autumn, 1957, pp. 430, 558; Winter, p. 685) are now almost sufficient for the Portrait Committee to shop for a painter. Contributions are still received at the Central Office with deep appreciation.

ACLS Awards

Among recipients of ten special $10,000 awards of the American Council of Learned Societies "for distinguished scholarly accomplishment in the humanities and social sciences," announced in February, were Arthur O. Lovejoy (Philosophy, Johns Hopkins), one of the Association's "Founding Fathers," and Walter P. Webb (American History, University of Texas), a present Council member.

Professors into Librarians

In a recent letter to this Editor, Dr. A. F. Kuhlman, Director of the Joint University Libraries, Nashville, takes note of the large number of teachers announcing their availability in the *Bulletin*, calls attention to the "several thousand library vacancies in institutions of higher learning," and continues:

Individuals with degrees from a good liberal arts college or university, especially an M.A. or Ph.D., and with teaching experience, should find many phases of college and university library work most satisfying if they like teaching and like to work with young people. There are many positions for which the minimum technical (library science) preparation could be obtained in a summer quarter or two—provided the individual has had a thorough liberal arts education, has language facility, and has the right personal qualifications for library work in a teaching situation. Financial remuneration should be no problem, since in many colleges and universities library staff has faculty rank and status and receives the same compensation as the teaching staff with comparable education and experience. The opportunities and needs are so great and urgent that possibly the AAUP and library schools can do something about this situation.

Membership

Procedures and Classifications

General Procedures

Membership in the American Association of University Professors is open by nomination and election to teachers and research workers on the faculties of approved colleges and universities (those on the lists of the established regional or professional accrediting agencies, subject to modification by action of the Association), and to present or recent graduate students of those institutions.

A prospective member must fill out the appropriate nomination form, have it signed by an already Active member, and send it to the Central Office. When eligibility has been established there, the nominee's name is published, and barring a sustained protest, his election to membership by the Committee on Membership takes place about six weeks after such publication.

The membership year in the Association is the calendar year (January 1 through December 31). The membership of nominees whose names are published in the Spring or Summer issue of the *Bulletin* becomes effective as of January 1 of the current year. The membership of nominees whose names are received too late for publication in the Summer issue of the *Bulletin* becomes effective as of January 1 of the following year unless the nominee requests that his membership become effective as of January 1 of the current year.

Membership by Nomination and Election

Active. One is eligible for Active membership if he has at least a one-year appointment to a position of at least half-time teaching and/or research, with the rank of instructor or its equivalent or higher or other acceptable evidence of faculty status, in an approved institution (one on the lists of the established regional or professional accrediting associations, subject to modification by action of the Association). Annual dues are $7.50. (Beginning January 1, 1959, dues will be $8.00.)

Junior. One is eligible for Junior membership if he is, or within the past five years has been, doing graduate work in an approved institution. Annual dues are $3.00. One may not become a Junior member

if he is also eligible for Active membership, and a Junior member must be transferred to Active membership as soon as he becomes eligible.

Membership by Transfer

Associate. An Active or Junior member whose academic work becomes primarily administrative must be transferred to Associate membership, a relatively inactive status. Annual dues are $3.00.

Emeritus. Any member retiring for age from a position of teaching or research may, at his own request, be transferred to Emeritus membership. Annual dues are $1.00.

Continuing Membership

Once elected, a member may change his occupation or transfer to an institution not on the Association's approved list without affecting his eligibility for continuance of membership.

Suspension or Resignation

One who chooses to have his membership temporarily suspended or permanently terminated must send written notice of his wish to the Central Office. In the absence of such notice, he is carried in the membership files for one calendar year, during which he receives the *Bulletin* and incurs an obligation to pay dues.

Reinstatement

One who wishes to resume his membership after it has lapsed should not go through the processes of nomination and election again, but should write to the Central Office asking to be reinstated. For present Association policy concerning reinstatement, see *Bulletin* 44: 1A, 309.

Nominations for Membership

The following 1516 nominations for Active membership and 104 nominations for Junior membership are published as provided in the Constitution of the Association. Protests of nominations may be addressed to the General Secretary of the Association, who will, in turn, transmit them for the consideration of the Committee on Membership. The Council of the Association has ruled that the primary purpose of this provision for protests is to bring to the attention of the Committee on Membership questions concerning the technical eligibility of nominees for membership as provided in the Constitution of the Association. To be considered, such protests must be filed with the General Secretary within thirty days after this publication.

Initial List of Nominations[1]

Active

DISTRICT I—ARIZONA, CALIFORNIA, NEVADA, UTAH, HAWAII

Arizona State College (Tempe), Robert L. Baker, Florence A. Bedell, Alden P. Buker, Edwin P. Grobe, James E. Johnson, William H. Stites; **University of Arizona,** Richard K. Burke, Lloyd E. Burton, Melba A. Garner, Charles J. Gross, Jr., Maurice K. Grossman, Robert B. Marlatt, Paul S. Martin, Emilio Osta, John R. Williams; **Bakersfield College,** Betty R. Bird; **California Institute of Technology,** Harold Lurie, Hardy C. Martel, Frank L. Spitzer, Charles H. Wilts; **California Western University,** Jeanne D. Lareau, Albert A. Lewis; **University of California (Los Angeles),** Stanford Drew, William H. Hildemann, Julian L. Kavanau, Patricia F. Knight; **University of California (Santa Barbara),** Mildred C. Robeck; **Chico State College,** John C. Ayres, LeVerne E. Brandstatt, Maria S. Haynes, Hoyt M. Jackson, Ritchie P. Lowry, Myles A. Tracy; **University of Hawaii,** Leona R. Adam, Charles F. Congdon, James C. Moomaw, Dorothy H. Niimoto, Sidney J. Townsley, Jess H. Walters; **Long Beach State College,** Sanford M. Helm, J. Richard Powell, Arlene A. Roster; **Los Angeles State College,** Randolph G. Service; **Loyola University of Los Angeles,** Angelo A. De Gennaro; **Modesto Junior College,** Steve S. Grillos, David J. Waterman, Jr., Lee A. Withrow; **Mt. San Antonio College,** Verne Zellmer; **University of Nevada,** Asher B. Wilson; **College of the Pacific,** Sherman H. Spencer; **Pasadena City College,** John F. Christopher; **Sacramento Junior College,** Carl G. Winter; **Sacramento State College,** Robert A. Good, John Sheedy; **San Diego Junior College,** Ivan L. Lauritzen; **San Diego State College,** George F. Crane, William A. Hunrichs, Stanley J. Pinceti, Jr., Themis T. Psomas; **City College of San Francisco,** Katherine N. Hondius; **University of San Francisco,** John B. Gleason, Irving Lowe, Richard E. Mulcahy; **San Jose State College,** Kenneth A. Johnston, Curtis R. Stafford; **Santa Barbara Junior College,** Charles L. Atkinson, Timothy Fetler; **University of Santa Clara,** Robert G. Meiners; **University of Southern California,** Leslie K. Kaeburn; **Stanford University,** Richard Alpert, Albert Bandura, Charles W. Barnett, Donald L. Bittner, Eugene M. Farber, George E. Forsythe, Charles Gardipee, Arthur S. Goldberger, Ruth T. Gross, William W. Hofmann, Herbert N. Hultgren, Ben B. Johnson, Charles E. McLennan, David M. Mason, Henry W. Newman, Lucy C. Rau, William C. Reynolds, Merrill E. Samuelson, Hale F. Shirley, Lyman M. Stowe, Benjamin N. Ward, Jerry S. Wiggins; **United States Postgraduate School,** Charles H. Rothauge; **University of Utah,** LaVern Adix, Keith M. Engar, Vadal Peterson, Leonard B. Sand, Robert E. Smith, Ted C. Smith, Aylmer H. Thompson.

DISTRICT II—IDAHO, MONTANA, OREGON, WASHINGTON, ALASKA, ALBERTA, BRITISH COLUMBIA, SASKATCHEWAN

University of Alaska, Orlando W. Miller, Charles K. Ray; **Idaho State College,** Clair L. Anderson, Loren L. Braun, Benjamin L. Gotham; **Lewis and Clark College,** Hauton B. Lee; **Montana State College,** Berenice G. Bayliss; **Montana State University,** J. Leslie Armour, Robert O. Bowen, Milton Colvin, Barbara J. Howell, Otto Stein; **Multnomah College,** John R. Deffenbaugh; **Eastern Oregon College,** Archie C. Dunsmoor, Floyd C. Hill, Wilson E. Merrill, William D. Spear, William P. Wells; **University of Oregon,** Vergil H. Dykstra; **Pacific Lutheran College,** Elvin M. Akre, Grace E. Blomquist, Harold M. Tetlie, Paul G. Vigness; **College of Puget Sound,** J. Stewart Lowther; **Reed College,** John F. Benton, Gilbert F. Gwillium, Laurens N. Ruben, Helen A. Stafford, Richard H. Tyre; **Seattle Pacific College,** Lester N. Habegger; **Western Washington College of Education,** William B. Knox, Harold G. Ogden, Richard F. W. Whittemore; **State College of Washington,** Wilfred E. Barnes, Donald W. Fletcher, Verner L. Johnson, Paul A. Klavano, Robert L. Stanley; **University of Washington,** Candido Ayllón, Leon H. Hurvitz; **Willamette University,** Alexander G. Michaelides, Clorinda R. Topping; **Yakima Valley Junior College,** Jane Huntzicker, Ruth R. Miller.

DISTRICT III—IOWA, MINNESOTA, NORTH DAKOTA, SOUTH DAKOTA, WISCONSIN, MANITOBA

Bemidji State College, Henry D. Dyck; **Coe College,** James N. Joyce; **Cornell College,** Donald G. Davison, William A. Deskin, Leroy J. Lamis, John T. Nothnagle, Gunter W. Remmling, Robert S. Witte; **Des Moines Still College of Osteopathy and Surgery,** Myron S. Magen; **Gustavus Adolphus College,** Emmer E. Engberg; **Hamline University,** Walter Fleming, Veronica M. From, Robert R. Harrison, Patricia J. Rand; **Huron College,** Kenneth E. Bandy, Gene W. Denison, Agnes J. Hanson, Marvin H. Hanson, E. Garner Horton, James A. Long, James T. Ross, Ralph G. Roth, Frank W. Smith, Philip L. Snowden, Miriam C. Speirs, Carl G. Tideman; **Iowa State College,** Boyd W. George, Emmit H. Haynes, John W. McDavid, Jr.; **State University of Iowa,** John W. Eckstein, John M. Harrison; **Lawrence College,** Woodrow V. Nold, Sumner Richman; **Marycrest College,** Raymond J. Jordan; **University of Minnesota,** Sherwood O. Berg, Samuel J. Deal, John R. Gordon, John A. Logothetis, Richard B. Mather, Merle P. Meyer, Dorothy L. Ness, Francis B. O'Leary, Kurt Pollak, Otto N. Raths, Jr., Earl A. Schultz, Leonard Schuman, Jerome T. Syverton, Frederick H. Van Bergen, Daniel N. Wiener; **North Dakota Agricultural College,** Sylvia M. Kruger,

[1] See Supplementary List, pp. 535ff.

Stanley N. Murray, Walter L. Wilson; **University of North Dakota,** James W. Hill, Robert H. Zoellner; **College of St. Teresa,** William F. Hill; **University of South Dakota,** Elmer W. Lammi; **Upper Iowa University,** Lyman R. Caswell; **Wartburg College,** G. Rudolph Bjorgan; **Westmar College,** Clayton D. Feis; **Wisconsin State College (Eau Claire),** Ruth L. Baker, Paul Nagel, Louise E. Yule; **Wisconsin State College (River Falls),** Robert W. Willson, Eliahu Wurman; **Wisconsin State College (Stevens Point),** Gladys Ishida, Edith S. Treuenfels; **Wisconsin State College (Superior),** Jay W. McKee; **Wisconsin State College (Whitewater),** Howard A. Barnett; **University of Wisconsin,** Gail E. Beck, Warrington W. Colescott, Eugene Rotwein, Manfred G. Wuerslin; **University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee),** Fern G. Ehlers, Katherine G. Nelson, Philip Perlson, Mathilde M. Schoessow, Frances J. Starms, Ruth D. Stoveken, Bernice J. Wolfson.

DISTRICT IV—Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Wyoming

Colorado State University, William R. Leith; **University of Colorado,** Jeremiah M. Allen, Burton G. Dwyre, Jr., Gordon Meiklejohn, Elda S. Popiel, Walter D. Weir; **University of Denver,** V. Lucile Vrooman; **Drury College,** Cecil L. French; **Fort Lewis Agricultural and Mechanical College,** David Berg, Delmar E. Calhoun, James W. Decker, Herbert E. Owen, Edwin Rosenkranz; **Hastings College,** Robert R. Carr, Thomas N. Filson, Warren A. Scharf, Robert Searby; **Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science,** Anthony M. Gawienowski, Robert W. Kiser, Louise M. Langford; **Kansas State Teachers College (Emporia),** John M. Mathews; **University of Kansas,** Elmo R. Richardson, Robert E. Schofield; **University of Kansas City,** Bernard Kleinman; **Lincoln University (Missouri),** Eva G. Wright; **Central Missouri State College,** Lorene L. Novotny, Rolla F. Wood; **Northwest Missouri State College,** Gilbert A. Whitney; **Southwest Missouri State College,** Don F. Hadwiger, Bill B. Lightfoot, Doris C. Lorz, Paul L. Redfearn, Jr., Charles E. Thompson, E. Jean Walker, William Walsh; **University of Missouri,** Don R. Webb; **University of Missouri (School of Mines and Metallurgy),** Robert R. Russell; **University of Nebraska,** Patricia Anna Abel, William R. Abel, Robert H. Harris, Richard G. Walsh; **St. Louis University,** Donald E. Flieder, William F. Geber, Barbara R. Landau, Oval A. Phipps, Karl K. Webber; **Washburn University of Topeka,** Henry J. Claycamp, Elroy J. Steele; **Washington University,** C. William Emory, William Gomberg, Alfred M. Holtzer, Grant Urry; **Western State College of Colorado,** Benjamin R. Tilghman; **William Jewell College,** Walter M. Hunt, Jr.; **University of Wyoming,** Sara Jane Rhoads, Charles H. Thompson; **Northern Wyoming Community College,** Montane C. Gustafson.

DISTRICT V—Arkansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas

Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College, Mallie T. Russell, Sadye A. Young; **Arkansas Polytechnic College,** Barbara G. Seagrave; **University of Arkansas,** Lester C. Howick, Frederic K. Spies, Betty A. Wallace, Willard H. Whitcomb; **Baylor University,** Ethel E. Erickson, Edward L. Rabb; **East Texas Baptist College,** Bernice L. Halbert, Shirley W. Handler, Era R. Miller, E. Frank Stinson, Seth R. Walton, Francis M. Warden, Eunice L. Ware; **University of Houston,** Dorothy Baker, Hallie L. Barrow, Julian Brandes, William G. Chambers, Joseph M. Coffer, Everett D. Dyer, John N. Fry, Leon F. Graves, Louise B. Hoffman, Sara E. Huggins, Ruth F. Morton, Zelda Osborne, Helen B. Rufener, Edgar L. Sherbenou, Sol Tannenbaum, Mary-Louise Vance, Richard L. Yates; **Lamar State College of Technology,** Ruth S. Coffey, France A. Meier, William Whipple, Jr.; **Laredo Junior College,** Phyllis L. Brown, Robert G. Buchanan, William K. Sewell; **New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts,** William J. Orr; **Eastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College,** Agnes L. Evins; **Pan American College,** Nai-tung Ting; **Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College,** Theodore A. Talbot, Melvin B. Tolson, Jr.; **St. Mary's University of San Antonio;** Frances S. Henke; **Southeastern State College,** Linnie R. Hall; **Southern Methodist University,** Evelyn F. Moorehead; **Southern State College,** Lyndal Smith; **Southwestern University,** Jimmy D. Baines, Carl O. Bergquist; **Stephen F. Austin State College,** Larry Covin; **Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas,** Rudolph E. Leighton, Norman C. Rose; **North Texas State College,** George W. Linden; **West Texas State College,** David D. Hanig, Thomas D. MacOwan, William H. Page; **Texas Technological College,** William M. Perel; **University of Texas** Andrew J. Broekema; **University of Texas (Medical School),** Johanna Blumel, Arr Nell Boelsche, Virginia Brantl, E. Ivan Bruce, James H. Cherry, Robert N. Cooley, Gunter Corssen, Sol Forman, Lee J. Haasis, Titus H. Harris, C. Olaf Haug, Norman G. Hawkins, Howard C. Hopps, E. Gartley Jaco, Grace K. Jameson, Wiley J. Jinkins, Jr., Oscar T. Kirksey, Pedro M. Lantin, Harry Levine, John Q. McGivney, Robert MacGregor, Gordon C. Mills, Charles Z. K. Mitis, Ardzroony A. Packchanian, Hyman W. Paley, Marcel Patterson, Morris Pollard, Martin Schneider, Samuel R. Snodgrass, Harry Stoeckle, Bruce E. Walker; **Texas Western College,** William H. Ball, Caleb A. Bevans, John P. Bloom, Fred M. Brewer, Richard W. Burns, Lillian R. Collingwood, Lurline H. Douglas, Eleanor L. Duke, Gene L. Erion, Wayne E. Fuller, Norman Gregor, Gladys Gregory, E. James Landers, Eugene W. Lewis, Ralph L. Lowenstein, Leif Neprud, Soledad Perez O., Joan H. Quarm, Jeannine H. Rowlette, James A. Thorburn, Jack C. Vowell, Jr., Roberta Walker; **Wayland Baptist College,** Wilma N. Cosper, Henry F. Eason, Martin W. Landers, David E. Moore, Ernestine Norton, Clarence E. Williams.

DISTRICT VI—Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio

Adrian College, Alice E. McKeehan; **University of Akron,** John W. Pulleyn, Jr., David C. Riede; **Augustana College (Illinois),** Marcus C. Bruhn, Elmer W. Copley, Ernest L. Karlstrom, Donald W. Peterson, James M. Wilcox; **Baldwin-Wallace College,** David G.

Elsass, William J. McBride, Themistocles Rodis; **Bay City Junior College,** Earl W. Smith; **Berea College,** Margaret Allen, Susan Arthur, Jacob C. Darnell, Donald C. Farley, Mildred C. Roberts, Frank Seto, Howard D. Tyner; **Blackburn College,** Dorothy H. Carrington; **Case Institute of Technology,** Wen-Hsiung Ko, Robert Plonsey; **Central State College (Ohio),** Richard D. Kidd; **Chicago City Junior College (Wilson Branch),** Eric S. Stein; **Chicago City Junior College (Wright Branch),** Alice C. Green, Reuben H. Segel, Daisy M. Tagliacozzo; **Chicago-Kent College of Law,** Fred F. Herzog, William F. Zacharias; **Chicago Teachers College,** Virginia G. McDavid; **University of Chicago,** Roger A. Pillet; **University of Cincinnati,** Betty Beaty, David G. Davies, Ronald G. Schmidt; **Concordia Teachers College (Illinois),** Cornell J. Kusmik; **DePaul University,** Alexander V. Davis, John C. Lynch; **DePauw University,** Robert I. Fletcher; **Detroit College of Law,** Chester J. Antieau; **Flint Junior College,** Mary Morrissey; **Henry Ford Community College,** Wanda Chrobak, Gawaine D. Dart, William O. Forster, Harold B. Goodall, Russell Griffiths, Waino V. Gustafson, Robert H. Harrison, Thomas S. Heywood, Angeline F. Jaje, Ferris E. Lewis, Martens E. Mueller, Henry F. Navarro, John E. O'Hare, Karl M. Place, Otto K. Rose, Raymond L. Spencer, Jacob Stern, Norman E. Tanis, William H. Tauck, Arthur D. Thomas, Jr., Jason D. Thornburg, Alvin H. Underwood, Paul A. Weidner, Harrison E. Welsh, Mary Lila Zang; **Highland Park Junior College,** Margaret S. Blayney; **Illinois State Normal University,** James E. Noah; **Northern Illinois University,** Edwin B. Shykind, Roy S. Steinbrook; **Southern Illinois University,** Lester R. Breniman, Randall H. Nelson, Carlyle C. Ring, D. Wayne Rowland, William E. Waska; **Western Illinois University,** Carole Williams; **University of Illinois,** Helen R. Duda, Robert H. Ennis, Bernard Farber, Irvin L. Heckmann, Jr., Beulah A. Hunziker, Paul T. Kinney, Walter W. McMahon, Queenie B. Mills, Roger C. Norton, C. P. Schumaier, Ranajit Sengupta, Robert W. Touchberry, George Wolf; **University of Illinois (Navy Pier),** Vivian C. Lipman; **Illinois Wesleyan University,** Ruth Erickson, Wilbur L. Ogden, Leo Schatz; **Indiana State Teachers College,** Hubert Knepprath; **Indiana University,** Jerome Ellison, Arlin D. Fentem, Sara H. Frye, Paul H. Gebhard, John S. Grimes, Jean C. Halterman, Norwood R. Hanson, Joseph R. Hartley, Walter Kaufmann, George H. T. Kimble, Bert C. McCammon, Jr., John A. Mears, Herbert C. Mueller, Pauline A. O'Melia, Verne Reynolds, Sue N. Rothschild, Ingeborg Schmidt, L. Vann Seawell, LaVern D. Walther, Ermine B. Wheeler-Voegelin, Elmus R. Wicker, Frank J. Zeller; **Kent State University,** Richard G. Bentley, Fay R. Biles, Ethelouise Carpenter, Roy W. Caughran, Harriet A. Danielson, Irene G. Drake, Phyllis S. Elliott, Alice Fenn, Richard E. Forzano, William Heasley, Bess R. Koval, Mae S. Kramer, Edward L. Masters, Henry Moulds, Glen T. Nygreen, Ann Elizabeth Palmer, Andrew W. Paton, Miska F. Petersham, Janet R. Rohrer, Manford B. Rotnem, Peter Slusarski, Robert M. Strahl, Henry L. Tapp, Harold E. Webb; **University of Kentucky,** Robert J. Buck, John T. Flint, Thomas P. Lewis, Gene M. Schramm, Ralph F. Wiseman; **Lake Erie College,** Albert Pugh; **Lincoln College (Illinois),** James G. Backes, Marie K. Bolley, Dale R. Brummet, Jeannette L. Gross, Norman D. Kaye, Sandra L. Madigan, Florence J. Molen, David Russell, Douglas R. Smith, Francis A. Cizon, Richard C. Hinners, Paul Mundy, John F. Reed, Arthur J. Scott, Orange A. Smalley; **Marietta College,** Paul J. Hutt; **Miami University,** Beatrice F. Chait, Bernard H. Kock, Elizabeth L. Ludlam, William J. McKinstry; **Central Michigan College,** Carl J. Couch, Carmel Elliott, Bernard J. Toney; **Eastern Michigan College,** Roger J. Callahan, Thornton H. Parsons, Floyd N. Reister; **Northern Michigan College,** Flora M. Loubert; **Michigan State University,** Curtis C. Aller, George B. Baehr, Bernard F. Engel, Russel H. Moore, Josephine O. Oudyn, James H. Platt; **Western Michigan University,** Edwin F. Beal; **University of Michigan,** Charles B. Beck, Gianlorenzo G. Cambon, Mary C. Crichton, Robert T. Firestone, William B. Harvey, Ismail Hoyi, Arnold S. Kaufman, Ralph A. Loomis, Jack E. McLaughlin, Warren E. Miller, James Olds, Robert K. Ritt; **Monticello College,** David W. Pierson; **Muskingum College,** Robert K. Gould, Herbert F. Wass; **Northwestern University,** B. J. Chandler, Thomas L. Davidson, Allen B. Mandelstamm, Severin Raynor; **University of Notre Dame,** Joseph Bobik, Peter T. Brady, Donald D. Coleman, Thomas J. McDonagh, Ralph M. McInerny, Francis E. O'Connor, Michael S. Pap; **Ohio Northern University,** George M. Joseph; **Ohio State University,** Shepherd Liverant; **Ohio University,** Ardyce S. Bowling, Frank R. Eaton, John J. Evans, Frederick D. Leach, Milton E. Ploghoft, Albert H. Shuster, Joseph R. Sligo, Barbara E. Thompson, William F. Willier, Rita L. Wilson; **Ohio Wesleyan University,** Edith Kelly, John H. Morey; **Our Lady of Cincinnati College,** Jane M. Glenn, Daniel J. Steible, Alfred G. Stritch, Sara S. Thompson, Francis F. Trefzger; **Purdue University,** Orian L. Hamilton, William J. Stadelman; **Rockford College,** Harold E. Lindahl, Jr.; **St. Marys College (Indiana),** Milko Jeglic; **Taylor University,** Albert W. Schroer; **University of Toledo,** Joseph A. Palermo, William D. Roll; **Wayne State University,** Richard C. Bedford, Robert M. Farnsworth, Karl H. Gayer, Edith Gold, Worth T. Harder, Helen J. Harris, Bette H. LaChapelle, Frederick B. Olsen, Christine C. Pickering, Arnold R. Pilling, Theodore R. Poole, George Rudisill, Jr., John C. Sullivan, Huling E. Ussery, Vincent C. Wall, Earl A. Weiley, Robert M. Whitrock, Ella Zwerdling; **Western Reserve University,** Hannah Hunt, Ralph H. Petrucci; **College of Wooster,** Richard P. Ament; **Youngstown University,** Paul B. Bien, Fanny Cleve, Raymond H. Dehnbostel, Esther Niemi, Clarice H. Stauffer, Elizabeth I. Sternberg, Jack Whitelock.

DISTRICT VII—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Panama Canal Zone, Puerto Rico

Alabama Agricultural & Mechanical College, Garland B. Bass, Leon W. Bonner, Fannie E. Hicklin, Thomas V. Morris; **Alabama Polytechnic Institute,** Paul Melius; **Alabama State College,** Nanina C. Alba, Joseph M. Brittain, Lawrence D. Reddick; **University of Alabama,**

José A. Benardete, Frederic A. Brett, Wilburt S. Brown, Joseph H. Hadley, H. Hardy Perritt, Benjamin B. Williams; **Benedict College,** Marian R. Davis; **Berry College,** William W. Hill, William R. Hoyt, Lawrence E. McAllister, Eleanor B. North, Barbara J. Paul; **Birmingham-Southern College,** James A. Doubles, Marjorie W. McWhorter; **Carson-Newman College,** Joe E. Barnhart; **Chipola Junior College,** Melvin C. Neeley, Earle C. Taylor; **David Lipscomb College,** Harry A. Butler, James N. Hobbs; **Emory University,** Edward E. Grace; **Fisk University,** Stephen D. Condon, Pearl K. Gunter, Robert Hayden; **Florida State University,** Robert H. Davis; **University of Florida,** Denver E. Baughan, Walter W. Bennett, Lalia Boone, May E. Burton, John M. De Grove, Jason L. Finkle, C. Glen Hass, Ernest M. Jones, June Kostyk, Annette L. Liles, Louis J. Maloof, Roy W. Niemela, Ouida F. Paul, Charles L. Robbins, Patricia J. Stenberg, Jennet M. Wilson; **Furman University,** Edward Beard, John H. Crabtree, Robert W. Crapps; **Grambling College,** Archie L. Lacey, Theodore C. Mayo; **Inter American University,** Robert E. Bittner; **Jacksonville University,** Arthur H. Bryan, Alberta G. Jackson; **Judson College,** Herbert LeR. Haney; **Knoxville College,** James A. Hamlett; **Southwestern Louisiana Institute,** Peter M. Tullier, Jr.; **Northwestern State College of Louisiana,** William C. Bennett, William C. Culp; **Louisiana State University,** Thomasina Blissard, Velma E. Bourgeois, Robert S. Friedman, Peter P. Fuchs, Raymond V. Lesikar, Grover E. Murray, Richard F. Norem, Bernard F. Sliger, Kenneth R. Wilson-Jones; **Mercer University,** Margaret H. Harris, Francis R. Otto; **University of Miami,** Philip Adler, Jr.; **Mississippi Southern College,** Holger J. Nyholm; **Mississippi State College for Women,** Ward S. Allen; **University of Mississippi,** Barton Milligan; **Pensacola Junior College,** Christopher W. Davis; **University of Puerto Rico,** Yilda R. Cruz, Carmen P. Roman; **University of the South,** Alain deLeiris, Stephen E. Puckette; **South Carolina State College,** James Latimer; **Southern University,** Joseph S. Anderson, J. Timothy Ashford, Twiley W. Barker, Jr., Norma M. Bradford, Morgan C. Brown, Lenore V. Buford, Selwart R. Clarke, Leslie H. Dawson, Elsie F. Edmondson, William C. Ferguson, Frederick I. Frisby, Samuel P. Geralds, Valmore R. Goines, Noel Gray, David W. Hazel, George T. Hedgespeth, Comradge L. Henton, Carolyn H. Hines, Wilfred A. James, Edward E. Johnson, Elizabeth R. Kelley, George A. Lawson, Roscoe E. Leonard, Milton Lowe, Joseph P. McKelpin, Carl L. Marshall, Kenneth C. Miller, Oliver Morse, Arthur J. Penson, James E. Slaughter, Russell L. Stockard, Vivian J. Tellis, Earlie E. Thorpe, Obadiah D. Williams, George W. Woody, Jr.; **Spartanburg Junior College,** Eugene B. Antley; **Spelman College,** Renate C. Wolf; **Talladega College,** William F. Brown, S. Lorenzo Harrison; **University of Tennessee,** Robert L. Fischer, Liston M. Fox, Leslie M. Gower, William E. Jefferson, Jr., Patrick Spurgeon, Curtis C. Whittington, Jr.; **Tulane University,** Fred R. Cagle, John Clemmer, Robert H. Helmer, Donald Pizer, Hans Wynberg.

DISTRICT VIII—Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, North Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia

American University, Charles M. Clark, Ruth E. McFeeter, Walter F. Muhlbach, Wylie H. Russell; **Appalachian State Teachers College,** Donval R. Simpson; **Catholic University of America,** Basil de B. Darwent, Max E. Guzikowski, Siegried A. Schulz; **Concord College,** John F. Rys; **Davis and Elkins College,** Burritt C. Harrington George Stolz; **District of Columbia Teachers College,** Seaborn L. Lyon; **Duke University,** Daniel A. Livingstone; **East Carolina College,** Robert R. Haubrich; **Gallaudet College,** Leon Auerbach, Harold J. Domich, Francis C. Higgins, Rudolph C. Hines, Adele J. Krug, Walter J. Krug, Agnes H. Oftedal, Donald A. Padden, Edward L. Scouten, Lucile Turner; **George Washington University,** Paul C. Adkins, Louis K. Alpert, Samuel M. Dodek, Owen Gwathmey, John Kaye, Calvin T. Klopp, Chester H. McCall, Jr., Harold J. Mills, Jr., Philip S. Morgan, Jr., William W. Stanbro, Richard W. Stephens, Robert F. Towson, Jr., George C. Weaver, Harland W. Westermann; **Georgetown University,** Eugene H. Bacon, Jan Karski, Charles Schertenleib; **High Point College,** Alexander V. Berkis, Joseph L. Bernd, Walter E. Hudgins, Lois Livingston, Raiford M. Porter, Ruth L. Worthington; **Hood College,** Helen C. MacLean; **Howard University,** Nicholas C. Anagnos, John W. Coleman; **Johns Hopkins University,** Laurence B. Senterfit; **Madison College,** Mildred D. Hoyt, John C. Wells; **Maryland State Teachers College (Frostburg),** Esther J. Doerr; **Maryland State Teachers College (Towson),** Curtis V. Martin; **University of Maryland,** Marta Korwin; **University of Maryland (Maryland State College),** David S. Lifson; **Meredith College,** Susanne H. Freund; **Montgomery Junior College,** Donald R. Bianco, Lewis C. Miles; **Morris Harvey College,** Coleman J. Harris; **University of North Carolina,** James F. Newsome; **Woman's College of the University of North Carolina,** Billie S. Wilbanks; **Peabody Institute of the City of Baltimore,** William S. Hart, Jr.; **Pfeiffer College,** George E. Melton; **Salem College (North Carolina),** Philip Africa, Mildred I. Byers, Bertram O. Cosby, B. Carson French, J. Carl Meigs, Jr., Stephen C. Paine, Wilmer D. Sanders, Edwin F. Shewmake; **Sweet Briar College,** Richard G. Carrott; **University of Virginia,** Douglas W. Eastwood, Charles J. Salisbury; **Wake Forest College,** Peter Baram, Charles S. Black, Justus C. Drake; **West Liberty State College,** Virginia N. Mills, Vernon D. Riemer; **Western Maryland College,** Donald R. Key.

DISTRICT IX—New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Ontario

Alliance College, Merle W. Wells; **Bard College,** Hsi Huey Liang; **Beaver College,** John W. Hathaway, Emily P. Mackinnon, Shirley P. Stone; **Brooklyn College,** Haig Ajamian, Herbert A. Bloch, O. Paul Dickinson, Norma H. Eisen, Abraham S. Eisenstadt, William H. Gerhard, Randolph Goodman, Miriam M. Heffernan, Murray M. Horowitz, Stephen P.

Marion, Leon Pearl, Samuel Pearlman, Alex S. Preminger, Louise Price, Harold M. Proshansky, Evelyn Raskin, Louis E. Rosenzweig, Max Siegel, Solomon Stone, Ethyle R. Wolfe; **Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn,** Judith Bregman, Murray Goodman, Harry Hochstadt, June R. M. Jensen, Frederick C. Kreiling, Chui H. Liu, Charles T. Salkind, Edward J. Smith, Andrew J. Terzuoli; **Bucknell University,** Rilla M. Phillips; **University of Buffalo,** Robert W. Mols; **Canisius College,** David J. Gorman; **Carnegie Institute of Technology,** William H. Castles, Jr., George S. Rosenberg, Hans A. Vetter; **City College,** Jeanne L. Noble; **Clarkson College of Technology,** Melvin A. Backman, William J. Battin, Jr., Aaron S. Filler, Robert Kirkwood, Marston LaFrance, Carleton Mabee, Martin C. Martin, Frank L. Moore, Jr., Charles Penrose, John H. Roch, Hilbert van N. Schenck, Jr.; **Colgate University,** John O. Rees, Jr., William Skelton; **Columbia University,** William P. Anderson, Jack Arends, Robert R. Bush, Gertrude P. Driscoll, I. Ignacy Goldberg, Melvin M. Grumbach, Abraham Jacobs, Clara A. Kaiser, Marcus N. Klein, Marshall Kolin, Daniel L. Larson, Lutie C. Leavell, Leon M. Lederman, Paul M. Legman, Henry H. Linn, John H. Mundy, Richard E. Neustadt, Lawrence D. Pinkham, Peter M. Riccio, Henry J. Rissetto, William Y. Tindall; **Cornell University,** Karl H. Fernow, Robert G. Heyneman, Francis M. R. Isenberg, J. Paul Leagans, Milton I. Roemer, Henry J. Romersa; **Drexel Institute of Technology,** Will J. Selzer; **Duquesne University,** Lawrence A. Roche; **Fashion Institute of Technology,** Rosa C. Balenzano, Ulderico E. Sacco; **Grove City College,** Howard P. Hinde, Daniel Leviton, James L. Sanderson; **Haverford College,** John R. Cary; **Hershey Junior College,** Paul E. Hofmann; **Hofstra College,** John O. Keller, Robert R. Maller; **Hunter College,** Dorothy B. Block, Gordon Fifer, Milton J. Gold, Julius I. Rosenthal; **Ithaca College,** Delbert Barley, Charles G. Friedman; **Jamestown Community College,** Arthur C. Chapman, William S. Curran; **Jersey City Junior College,** William D. Brower; **Lafayette College,** John R. Duncan, Robert W. Imel, Carroll W. James, Zbigniew D. Jastrzebski, Peter P. Pardoe; **Lincoln University (Pa.),** Robert E. Winters; **Long Island University,** Leo Greenberg, Lawrence Ritt, Jack Sosinsky; **Manhattan College,** Edward R. Brohel, Otto A. de Choibert; **Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart,** Robert W. Hoeffner; **Mills College of Education,** Roger Cartwright, Henry Krul; **Monmouth College (N. J.),** Samuel S. Abdul-Haqq, Albert T. Ball, Berjouhi Barsamian, LeRoy E. Bassett, Margaret D. Blount, William T. Boylan, Astere E. Claeyssens, Bertram Crocker, David M. Espey, Galen T. Goewey, John P. Illo, Margaret G. Juckett, Margaret S. La Morte, Kenneth D. Loeffler, Gabriel H. Lovett, Demetrius D. Markov, Arthur J. T. Maroney, Rose Mary Miller, Felix F. Molzer, Helen Nezval, Robert M. Rechnitz, Robert J. Sipos, Robert J. Tompa, Robert F. Van Benthuysen, Donald Warncke; **Moravian College,** John J. Gehman, Otis H. Shao; **Muhlenberg College,** Theodore Maiser, Robert Parke, Jr.; **Newark College of Engineering,** John A. Bishop, Hall H. Graves, Robert E. Kiehl, Martin J. Levy, Lawrence E. Loveridge, Gerson L. Ram, Leonard Shapiro, Harold P. Wasson, Stanley B. Winters, George P. Zirnite; **New Jersey State Teachers College (Glassboro),** Robert H. McCobb; **New York City Community College of Applied Arts & Sciences,** Rose H. Accardi; **New York Medical College,** Isabel J. Wajda.

New York, State University of

College for Teachers at Buffalo, Carlton E. Bauer, Janet E. Swayne; **Teachers College at Brockport,** M. Marian Hegman, Louis Hetler, Leo E. Svitavsky; **Teachers College at Cortland,** Robert H. Coulson, Norbert Lerner, Robert E. Rhodes, Robert B. Sprague; **Teachers College at Fredonia,** Daniel Berman, Phyllis M. Borzelliere, Stella Buzzella, Ann M. Keane, Alan McLeod, J. Brien Murphy, John Ohles, Herman Rowan, Nellie Walent; **Teachers College at Oswego,** Harrison F. Bartle, Norman M. Chansky, Johnson G. Cooper, Harold O. Powers.

New York University, Gilbert J. Clausman, Vincent J. Collins, John F. Daly, Adolph M. Dettloff, Theodore D. Ellsworth, Emanuel E. Fisher, Arnold J. Friedhoff, A. Anton Friedrich, Karen R. Gillespie, Helen F. Keane, Peggy M. Keogh, Fannie J. Klein, Casper J. Kraemer, Jr., Paul D. Leedy, C. Robin LeSueur, Harriet B. Linton, Elizabeth D. Munves, George W. Stone, Jr., Otto R. Trautz, Irma Tuck-Weiss; **Pennsylvania Military College,** Eleanor Logan; **Pennsylvania State University,** Vernon V. Aspaturian, Alfred F. Dombrowski, James N. East, Alan W. Taylor, Frank E. Walser; **University of Pennsylvania,** Kenneth Lande, Curtis R. Reitz, Walter Selove, George B. Tatum; **Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania,** Abraham M. Frumin; **Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science,** Arthur Osol, Francis M. White; **University of Pittsburgh,** Marvin J. Taylor; **Pratt Institute,** Jack Bellick, Mario A. DiCesare, Eleanor Pepper; **Princeton University,** Blanchard W. Bates, Robert C. Bolles, Joseph Brown, Richard J. Browne, David R. Coffin, Francis A. Comstock, Erling Dorf, Bruce M. Eberhart, Richard C. Exner, Lewis Hertzman, Norman D. Hinton, Henry A. Jandl, S. Sheldon Judson, Jr., Stanley Kelley, Jr., Robert A. Koch, Robert W. McLaughlin, Howard Menand, Jr., Charles W. Moore, Julian L. Moynahan, Joseph M. Notterman, Gardner Patterson, John S. Robinson, Robert B. Y. Scott, William F. Strother, Edward D. Sullivan, Silvan S. Tomkins, Melvin M. Tumin; **Queens College (New York),** Solomon Newborn, Everett S. Ostrovsky; **Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute,** Roland M. Lichtenstein, Heinrich A. Medicus, Henry J. Sneck, Jr.; **University of Rochester,** William E. Armstrong, Alan W. Barnett, Albert B. Craig, Jr., Martin Morrison; **Rosemont College,** Thomas L. Carney, Ormond Macoretta, Clare M. Shaw; **Rutgers, The State University,** Alexander D. Brooks, Robert R. Raymo, John A. Stone, Louis H. Swartz; **St. Francis College (Pa.),** Rita M. Cancio; **St. John's University (N. Y.),** Joseph A. Bardwil, Angela C. Coletti, Robert A. Linzmeyer, Thomas F. Mader, Aurelius G. Mignone, Philip A. Niessen, Sensitiva E. Soricri, George T. Starrs,

Jeanne K. Welcher; **St. Lawrence University,** William H. Plows; **Sarah Lawrence College,** Adele R. Brebner, Esther Raushenbush, Bernard Steinzor; **Seton Hall University,** John S. Benassi, Jean L. L. Comhaire, Joseph P. Harvan, Donald L. Martin, George L. A. Reilly, Louis L. de Simone; **Skidmore College,** Joan G. McAlevey; **Stevens Institute of Technology,** Alfred Bornemann, Frederick P. Bowes, Gregory Comstock, Jack Fajans, John P. Fife, Franklin Furst, Stephen J. Hazelton, Richard D. Humphrey, Charles F. Kientzler, Robert H. Page, Leo Reich, George P. Rettig, Allen H. Spinner, Rolf Weil, Myron E. White; **Syracuse University,** Sanford J. Dean, Gordon Kent, Philip H. Lee, Edward J. Owen, Walter Stellwagen; **Temple University,** Amelia Hoover, Arthur O. Ketels; **Union College and University,** Philip C. Hewitt, Joseph Modrey; **U. S. Merchant Marine Academy,** Frederick W. Poos; **Vassar College,** Elaine M. Bjorklund, Lloyd D. Musolf; **Villanova University,** Isabelle S. Godek, Ernest F. Roberts, Jr.; **Wilkes College,** Phyllis I. Clark; **Yeshiva University,** Morris Epstein, Boris M. Levinson.

DISTRICT X—Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec

American International College, Georgia H. Prue, Jesse O. Richardson; **Boston University,** Jules Chametzky, Louise A. Frey, Barbara E. Moulton, Julian S. Myers, John W. Ottiano, Wesley F. Pratzner, Catherine W. Tinkham, Marx W. Wartofsky; **Brandeis University,** Irving Howe, Romney Robinson, Samuel Shapiro; **University of Bridgeport,** Marjorie R. Hansen, Donald E. Payne, Michael E. Somers, Mitchell D. Triwedi, Louise C. Turner; **Clark University,** Thomas T. Sugihara, Morton Wiener; **Connecticut College,** Errol E. Harris; **Teachers College of Connecticut,** Rodney B. Card, Robert C. Soule; **University of Connecticut,** George Asherman, Emil O. Bernstein, I Ridgway Davis, Louis L. Gerson, Dorothy C. Goodwin, Fred Kort, David Mars, Harold M. Thewlis; **Danbury State Teachers College** Richard O. Riess; **Dartmouth College,** Dana L. Abell, Eugene J. Becker, Allan R. Brick, Wayne G. Broehl, Jr., Colin D. Campbell, Virginia Lee Close, Robert W. Decker, Timothy J. Duggan, Van H. English, Robert A. Feer, Thomas J. Finn, Jr., Lawrence E. Harvey, Albert I. Heckbert, William R. Lansberg, Donald R. Loftsgordon, William H. McCarter, John A. Menge, Leonard E. Morrissey, Robert H. Russell, Thaddeus Seymour, Vilhjalmur Stefansson, Richard W. Sterling, Donald W. Wendlandt; **Endicott Junior College,** Robert R. Hayward; **Fairfield University,** Vincent J. De Carlo; **Green Mountain College,** Bertram M. Towle; **Harvard University,** Livingston Hall, Hans F. Hofmann, Albert M. Sacks, Byron H. Waksman; **Hebrew Teachers College,** Israel Gold; **University of Maine,** Stanley L. Freeman, Jr.; **Massachusetts Institute of Technology,** Chadwick J. Haberstroh, George N. Hatsopoulos; **Massachusetts School of Art,** Lawrence Kupferman; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Boston),** Lauréat J. Bernard, Edith G. De Angelis, Marie I. Farrell, Alice F. Linnehan, Alfred P. Pompeo; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Worcester),** Achille A. Joyal; **Merrimack College,** Charles J. Huelsbeck; **Mitchell College (Connecticut),** B. Joyce Miller; **University of New Hampshire,** Ruth E. Moses; **New Haven State Teachers College,** Ruth P. Boak, Francis J. Degnan; **Norwich University,** Allan B. Nash, Clifford G. Robertson, Clarence F. Willey; **Pine Manor Junior College,** Elizabeth S. Case; **University of Rhode Island,** Jeannette E. Crooker, Francis J. Gilligan, Wesley C. Panunzio, John F. Price; **Simmons College,** Alice W. Jones; **Smith College,** Allen H. Kassof; **Springfield College,** Emile O. Schmidt; **Tufts University,** Sylvan Barnet, Samuel Epstein, Benjamin B. Hersey, Dallas Laskey; **University of Vermont,** Sadah S. Start; **Wellesley College,** Eleanor T. Brzenk, Gwen M. Stose; **Worchester Polytechnic Institute,** Thaddeus H. Roddenbery; **Yale University,** Stephen Fleck, Mead L. Jensen, Ellen A. Peters, James Tobin, Horace Winchell.

Junior

District I—University of Southern California, William H. McGrath; **Utah State University,** Hazel M. Johnson.

District III—University of Minnesota, Warren B. Franzen, Florian J. Hering, Allan N. Nash; **University of Wisconsin,** Joseph Maltby.

District IV—Colorado State University, Otto Wendel; **University of Denver,** Charles P. Bartl; **Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg),** Lenell M. Slaten; **University of Kansas,** George L. Duerksen; **University of Nebraska,** David W. Wells.

District V—Eastern New Mexico University, C. Ardath White; **University of Texas (Medical Branch),** Charles R. Capers, Jess M. McKenzie, Lois I. Mendle.

District VI—University of Chicago, Richard B. Shekelle; **Southern Illinois University,** James Lee Bateman, Louis J. Eovaldi, Thomas M. Gwaltney, Jr., Dennis R. Hale, Myrtle A. Hidritch, Earl W. Morris; **University of Illinois,** Barna M. Avré, Corwin M. Mokler, Joseph Schrailman; **Indiana University,** Harold R. Gillespie, Jr., Richard L. Girsch, Rolla F. Pruett; **Kent State University,** Adam B. Cibula, Lois W. Douglass, Donald D. Drumm, Dona Gerson, David B. Lantz, Alexander Stowba, Julia M. Waida, Ralph H. Walker; **University of Louisville,** Earl A. Alluisi, Mary Meccia; **University of Michigan,** Robert E. Dalton, Charles R. Goldman; **Northwestern University,** Thaddeus R. Gatza; **Purdue University,** Gerhardt P. Kreher, Robert L. Yount.

District VII—University of Alabama, William H. Baker, John L. Sanders; **Emory University,** Harris E. Stevenson; **Louisiana State University,** Othel E. Lovell; **University of Tennessee,** Frederick Bailey, William D. Foland; **Tulane University,** Benjamin L. Gorman, Gerald B. Hoag, Joseph A. Slechta.

District VIII—Catholic University of America, Pingkun Lee; **Duke University,** Bernard H. Strasser; **George Washington University,** Howard R. Roberts, Zena N. Valenziano; **University of Virginia,** Arthur B. Thompson, Jr.

District IX—Adelphi College, Frank Rosengarten; **Brooklyn College,** Libby G. Bay, Sidney Belanoff, Marjorie N. Boyer, Julius Briller, George M. Evica, Edward Spingarn; **Columbia University,** Joseph A. Kosove, Gita May; **Cornell University,** Arthur D. Larson; **Duquesne University,** Stanislaw A. Piwowarski; **Hofstra College,** Melvin Pukatch; **Monmouth College, (N.J.),** Robert F. Allen; **New York University,** Julius Kane, Jacob Oxman; **Pennsylvania State University,** Robert Rommel; **University of Pennsylvania,** Patrick J. Kelly; **Princeton University,** Joseph I. Donohoe; **Rutgers, The State University,** Robert P. Biunno; **Syracuse University,** O. Thomas Beirne, Frederic J. Masback; **Upsala College,** Bertha B. Quintana.

District X—Boston University, John Howie; **University of Connecticut,** Vinton D. Fisher, Jr., Mary J. Gauthey, Richard A. Ladd, Robert W. Rider; **Dartmouth College,** Marvin L. Bender; **Harvard University,** Sheila Prasad; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Boston),** Walter E. Hannigan; **University of Vermont,** Arthur S. Kunin.

Other Junior Members—Joseph E. Bray, M.A., **Eastern Michigan College;** James A. Butler, Ph.D., **University of Southern California;** John R. Slow, M.S., **Southern Illinois University.**

Supplementary List of Nominations

The preceding list contains 1287 nominations for Active membership and 91 nominations for Junior membership. The following 229 nominations for Active membership and 13 nominations for Junior membership were received too late for inclusion in the preceding list. The combined lists total 1516 and 104 as previously stated.

Active

DISTRICT I—Arizona, California, Nevada, Utah, Hawaii

Hartnell College, Howard Braverman; **Mills College,** Darl E. Bowers, Lawrence K. Moss; **Modesto Junior College,** Ralph E. Sherman; **Phoenix College,** Reginald D. Bailey, Mary-Lou Coppock, Dallas C. Long, Bruce B. Smith; **Sacramento Junior College,** Allan Ramsey, Albert S. Rodda; **San Diego State College,** Henry L. Janssen, Ned V. Joy; **San Francisco State College,** James R. Wilson, **University of San Francisco,** Donald W. Brandon, Robert C. MacKenzie, Vincent J. Moran, Jack D. Reese; **Utah State University,** Vernon L. Israelsen, Dean N. Quinney.

DISTRICT II—Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Alaska, Alberta, British Columbia, Saskatchewan

Montana State University, Robert E. Fischer; **Southern Oregon College,** Arnold D. Wolfe; **University of Oregon,** Albert T. Bharucha-Reid; **State College of Washington,** Mary Rose Gram, Gertrude Nygreen.

DISTRICT III—Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Manitoba

Coe College, George M. Powell; **Grinnell College,** Rupert A. Hawk; **Iowa State Teachers College,** Jens A. Jensen; **Marquette University,** James M. Roherty; **University of Minnesota,** Paul Knowles, Roy D. Wilcoxson; **Northern State Teachers College,** Harold H. Vannatter; **University of Wisconsin,** Roy E. Nichols; **University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee),** Eileen E. Iberg.

DISTRICT IV—Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Wyoming

University of Colorado, Frances R. Bascom, Benjamin H. Spurlock, Jr.; **Fort Lewis Agricultural and Mechanical College,** William J. Mitchell; **Hannibal-LaGrange College,** Nina M. Cloyd; **Harris Teachers College,** William C. B. Luebkert; **University of Missouri,** Edwin H. Pleasants; **University of Nebraska,** Allan Axelrod; **St. Louis University,** Pietro O. Bramante; **Washington University,** Michael W. Friedlander; **University of Wichita,** Clark V. Britton, Jr.; **University of Wyoming,** Eugene N. Hardy, Burton H. Muller.

DISTRICT V—Arkansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas

Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College, W. M. Phillips, Jr.; **Arkansas State College,** Baird V. Keister; **University of Houston,** Wendell Howard, Gholam H. Razi; **University of New Mexico,** Duane R. McClary; **University of Oklahoma,** Emilio Amero; **Rice Institute,** Bradford B. Hudson; **Stephen F. Austin State College,** Sally M. Gearhart; **University of Texas,** Clyde L. Hardin, Ralph E. Lane, L. John Parker, Robert M. Taylor; **University of Texas (Medical Branch),** Harold A. Goolishian; **University of Texas (Southwestern Medical School),** Ernest E. Muirhead; **Texas Western College,** Wade J. Hartrick, Murray Projector.

DISTRICT VI—ILLINOIS, INDIANA, KENTUCKY, MICHIGAN, OHIO

Adrian College, B. H. Crusinberry, Howard C. Emrick, George G. Lake; **Anderson College and Theological Seminary,** John O. Carrington, Val B. Clear, Pichon P. Y. Loh, Elbridge G. MacKenzie, James D. Macholtz, John I. Owen, Frederick V. Shoot; **University of Cincinnati,** Robert A. Deshon, Robert J. Stevens, Edward L. Wolfley; **Illinois State Normal University,** Thomas W. Floyd; **Northern Illinois University,** Merlin D. Gustafson; **Southern Illinois University,** Florence A. Fanning, Mary A. Wyatt; **University of Illinois,** Stewart S. Cairns, Howard A. Osborn; **Indiana University,** C. Donald Peet, Jr., Howard L. Timms; **University of Kentucky,** Jean G. Hobart; **Lake Erie College,** Eugene W. Schulkind; **University of Louisville,** Beverly T. Towery; **Loyola University (Illinois),** Magda B. Arnold; **Miami University,** Harold D. Webster; **Western Michigan University,** Edwin Grossnickle, Jerome G. Manis, Ann M. Shaw, John W. Woods; **University of Michigan,** Donald Hall; **University of Notre Dame,** George W. Ford, David W. Juenker; **Ohio Northern University,** Andrew Stauffer; **Purdue University,** Eric C. Noller, Calvin O. Schrag; **Transylvania College,** H. David Jenkins, B. Franklin Lewis; **Wayne State University,** Charles L. Boye, Vida K. Malik, Thomas B. Stone, Horace J. Weiss; **Wilmington College (Ohio),** Evalyn N. Hibner, Lucile La Ganke; **College of Wooster,** H. Gray Multer; **Youngstown University,** Dominic L. Rosselli.

DISTRICT VII—ALABAMA, FLORIDA, GEORGIA, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, SOUTH CAROLINA, TENNESSEE, PANAMA CANAL ZONE, PUERTO RICO

Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College, Mary A. Smith; **Alabama Polytechnic Institute,** Paul W. Lindsey, Jr.; **Berry College,** Goldie J. Douglas, Henry P. Douglas, Howard M. Kinlaw; **Fisk University,** Mabel R. Love; **Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College,** Leonard H. O. Spearman; **University of Florida,** Paul R. Chalker; **Judson College,** Virginia Foster; **North Greenville Junior College,** Elsie F. Tuttle; **Pensacola Junior College,** Elmer A. Habel; **University of the South,** Thomas F. Dorn; **South Carolina State College,** Ernest C. E. Pinson, Reginald R. Thomasson; **Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College,** Alonzo A. Carmichael, Rhoda J. Carmichael, Joseph F. Douglas, Marcia L. Mitchell, Bernard L. Peterson, Jr.; **Spartanburg Junior College,** Verona M. Thomas; **University of Tennessee,** Leon C. Lantz.

DISTRICT VIII—DELAWARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, MARYLAND, NORTH CAROLINA, VIRGINIA, WEST VIRGINIA

Davis and Elkins College, Sterling C. Adams; **Duke University,** Winston Broadfoot; **Gallaudet College,** Carl G. Croneberg, Andrew J. Vasnick; **George Washington University,** Alton H. Desmond, Herbert L. Ley, Jr.; **Georgetown University,** Orlando H. Lobo; **Marshall College,** Margaret S. Bobbitt; **Morris Harvey College,** Evelyn L. K. Harris, Walter H. Walker; **Mount St. Mary's College (Maryland),** Robert A. Seidel; **North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering,** Evan J. Williams; **Peabody Institute of the City of Baltimore,** Mary M. Hunter; **Virginia Polytechnic Institute,** William E. Field; **Wake Forest College,** Charles E. McCreight, Robert G. Watson; **West Liberty State College,** Lois Anne Shumway; **West Virginia Institute of Technology,** Maynard E. Hall.

DISTRICT IX—NEW JERSEY, NEW YORK, PENNSYLVANIA, ONTARIO

Brooklyn College, Abraham Bernstein, Emerson Coyle, Howard E. Hugo, Martin Landau, Adele M. Miller, J. Ellsworth Missall; **Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn,** Max I. Baym, Helmut Gruber, Violet B. Halpert, Albert Kotin, Benjamin Post, Harold I. Sharlin, Alfred Zajac; **Chatham College,** Calvin W. Lane, Cecilia L. Rasdorf; **Clarkson College of Technology,** Ralph G. Gentile, Frank K. Schwaneflugel; **Columbia University,** James M. Fitch, Edwin Ziegfeld; **Drexel Institute of Technology,** Robert Botel, Richard W. Gosa; **Hofstra College,** Stanley P. Goldstein; **Hunter College,** Monroe Grossman; **Lincoln University (Pennsylvania),** Paul Kuehner, Donald C. Yelton; **Long Island University,** Roy Ilowit; **Manhattan College,** Herbert L. Zuschin; **Monmouth College (New Jersey),** Irving J. Shapiro, Charles A. Wolbach; **New Jersey State Teachers College (Newark),** Joseph B. Higgins, Jr.; **New Jersey State Teachers College (Trenton),** Roger W. McKinney.

NEW YORK, STATE UNIVERSITY OF—

College for Teachers at Buffalo, Janet Erickson; **Teachers College at Brockport,** Estella M. Bassett; **Teachers College at Oswego,** Bruce J. Breland, Harvey S. Harris, John X. McConkey; **Teachers College at Potsdam,** Harry E. Kristiansen.

New York University, J. Marion Bryant; **University of Pennsylvania,** Henry Wells; **Princeton University,** Roger H. Sessions; **Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute,** Isadore Traschen; **Rochester Institute of Technology,** Robert G. Koch; **University of Rochester,** H. Pearce Atkins, Harry Fulbright; **Rosary Hill College,** Dorothy M. Condon, Wilbert D. Eger, Sister M. Florentine, James K. Y. Kuo, Sister M. Urban; **Seton Hall University,** John R. Harrington, Warren T. Ward; **Stevens Institute of Technology,** Maurice E. Kasten, Joel L. Lebowitz; **Temple University,** Curtis Wright, Jr.; **Union College and University,** Valter E. Pilcher; **Upsala College,** George Dolger; **Yeshiva University,** William E. Block, Wagner H. Bridger, Morris Gall.

DISTRICT X—CONNECTICUT, MAINE, MASSACHUSETTS, NEW HAMPSHIRE, RHODE ISLAND, VERMONT, NEW BRUNSWICK, NOVA SCOTIA, QUEBEC

Boston College, Walter G. Langlois; **Boston University,** Ann E. Lord; **University of Bridgeport,** Edward R. Astarita; **Dartmouth College,** Robert Y. Turner; **Green Mountain College,** Joanna L. Ball, Arnold Chadderdon, Wilfred Saint, Jr., Neil N. Whitehurst; **Lowell**

Technological Institute, Gerald Smithson; **University of Maine,** Franklin P. Eggert, Charles H. Merchant, Elizabeth F. Murphy, Seymour J. Ryckman, George M. Woodwell; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Framingham),** Thomas F. Kenney; **Mount Holyoke College,** Bulkeley Smith, Jr.; **Norwich University,** Loring E. Hart, Dallas A. Jestes, Herbert E. Lindner; **University of Rhode Island,** Frank J. De Luise; **Simmons College,** Josephine F. Milburn; **Trinity College (Connecticut),** Edmond Cherbonnier; **Wellesley College,** Cary Claez; **Worcester Polytechnic Institute,** Arthur Herschman.

AMERICAN CONTROLLED INSTITUTIONS ABROAD

Robert College, Keith M. Greenwood.

Junior Members

DISTRICT III

University of Wisconsin, Dean C. Frye, Merlynd K. Nestell.

DISTRICT VI

Southern Illinois University, Blanche M. Ganahl, John W. Stull.

DISTRICT VII

University of Florida, Joel M. Savell.

DISTRICT IX

Brooklyn College, Irwin Nack, Talbert Ripps; **City College,** John L. Butler; **New York University,** George G. Dawson; **University of Rochester,** Robin Brooks; **Yeshiva University,** Marcel Perlman.

DISTRICT X

Yale University, John G. Suess.

OTHER JUNIOR MEMBERS

Charles A. Huttar, Ph.D., **Northwestern University.**

Elections to Membership

The Committee on Membership announces the election to membership in the Association of 2161 Active and 279 Junior Members. These include those nominations published in the Spring, 1958 *Bulletin,* with the exception of one published in error.

Transfers from Junior to Active

Alabama Polytechnic Institute, J. Buckminster Ranney; **University of Arizona,** Cornelius Steelink; **University of Delaware,** Roy Leonard; **University of Hawaii,** Rodney B. Yarberry; **Southern Illinois University,** Virgil Seymour; **La Salle College,** Robert E. Quigley; **Michigan State University,** William A. Faunce; **New York University,** Dorothy Moore; **Norwich University,** Herschel G. Miller; **Panhandle Agricultural and Mechanical College,** John L. Cogdill; **University of Pennsylvania,** Simon D. Messing; **Pfeiffer College,** Nancy D. McLaurin; **Syracuse University,** Edward G. McGrath; **North Texas State College,** Stanley A. Self.

Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available

To assist in the placement of college and university teachers, the American Association of University Professors publishes notices of academic vacancies and of teachers available. Factual data and expressions of personal preference in these notices are published as submitted. It is optional with appointing officers and teachers to publish names and addresses or to use key numbers.

A member of the Association is entitled to one announcement of his availability, each volume-year, at the rate of 50 cents a line, subsequent insertions being charged for at the rate of $1.00 a line. Nonmembers may also insert announcements at the rate of $1.00 a line for each insertion. There is a charge of $1.00 for each cross-reference. There is no charge to institutions of higher learning for the announcement of academic vacancies. Copy should be received seven weeks before publication date.

Letters in response to announcements published under key numbers should be sent to the Association's Central Office for forwarding to the persons concerned, a separate letter for each person. Address in care of the General Secretary, American Association of University Professors, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

Vacancies Reported[1]

Administration, financial: By Near East College Association, Inc., Room 521, 40 Worth Street, New York 13, assistant comptroller, to share in supervision of accounting staff of 5, in non-profit organization assisting 10 American corporations established in this country to operate educational institutions in the Near East. Salary approximately $7000 (based on experience and training) with good possibility of advancement. Work varied, interesting, responsible.

Foreign Languages: Ph.D., man preferred, but would consider a woman. Major: German. Minor: French and/or Spanish and other languages. Some college experience. Assistant or associate professor. Salary: $5000–5500, depending on experience and qualifications. V 1427

Philosophy: Midwestern liberal arts college for women desires Ph.D. for September, 1958. Salary and rank depend on previous experience, publication, etc. From $5000. Must be of Catholic faith. V 1428

The Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, has vacancies in the Department of Mathematics. Most of the work is at advanced undergraduate and graduate level. Employment will be effected in accordance with Civil Service regulations. Grade levels available are: GS-9 ($5440–6250), instructor; GS-11 ($6390–7465), assistant professor; GS-12 ($7570–8645), associate professor. Applications should be made on Standard Form 57, available at any Post Office, or by letter to Dr. Albert B. Carson, Head of the Department of Mathematics, ITDSE, Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

An opening exists for an assistant, associate or full professor in the Department of Mechanics, Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. Applicants should possess M.S., with industrial or teaching experience, or Ph.D. Teaching assignment may vary from undergraduate mechanics courses through advanced graduate courses in aircraft and missile structures, aeroelasticity, missile ballistics, and advanced dynamics. Employment effected under Civil Service regulations at the grades of GS-11, 12, or 13. Address D. W. Breuer, Acting Head, Department of Mechanics, as above.

[1] See also page 544.

Teachers Available

Accounting (Business Administration, Economics, Business Education Courses): Man, 37. B.S. and Master's; 6 years' experience public accounting, 5 years' industrial accounting, presently assistant treasurer; 3 years' college level teaching accounting subjects. Prefer teaching career. A 6847

Accounting, including C.P.A. Review: Man, 40, family. C.P.A., M.B.A. (Chicago). Extensive experience in university teaching, public practice and governmental administration. Interested in teaching and/or administration. Desire to move family to pleasant climate. A 6848

Administration: $8000 "Master Teacher" with Ed.D., high qualifications, years of experience in education, and superior references, seeks high level administrative opportunity or tenure teaching position in junior college, senior liberal arts or teachers college, or university; will not consider administration or teaching in any institution lacking adequate facilities or democratic progressive administrators; experienced in administration as a high-school principal and as a dean of students of a state teachers college; have taught professional education courses and biological sciences at college level and all high-school science courses; prefer non-metropolitan location in warm dry climate, but will consider other opportunities. A 6849

Administration: See Biology, Key No. A 6851.

Art: Man, 51, Roman born and educated, American citizen. Specialist in sculpture and architectural decoration, but work in most media. Student at Academy of Fine Arts, Bologna, and under famous masters. Teacher, notable Italian schools; winner of several competitions; participant in many exhibits; represented in public and private collections; appointee to public posts of honor and responsibility. Member artistic associations and De Young Museum. Available summer or fall, 1958. A 6850

Audio-Visual: See French, Key No. A 6861.

Biology: Man, 41, married, 4 children. Ph.D. Protestant. 9 years' college-level teaching experience; numerous publications. Sigma Xi, Society of American Bacteriologists, listed in *American Men of Science*. Associate professor, acting head of department. Excellent references. Invite correspondence regarding post as dean of science, research directory, or department head in microbiology. Desire appointment in Midwest university or state college. A 6851

Biology, Zoology: Man, 33, married, 1 child. Ph.D. Research area marine invertebrates. 5 years' teaching experience, including invertebrate zoology, general biology, microtechnique. [Withdrawn]

Business Administration, Marketing, Economics: Man, 35, married, family. B.A., M.B.A.; Ph.D. courses completed at New York University (Graduate School of Business Administration). 4½ years' experience operating own business. 6 years prior experience in college teaching (economics, marketing, business management, retailing, money and banking, American industry and economic geography, salesmanship, statistics, personnel administration, advertising, and other courses). Member: AAUP, A.M.A., A.E.A., Delta Sigma Pi. *Who's Who in the West*. Conducted market research projects for several companies. Available immediately for teaching and/or administrative activity. A 6853

Chemistry: Man, 57, married. 2 boys. B.S., Haverford; Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania. 30 years in teaching. 20th year in present position. Wish to change to a liberal arts college of 750 students or less. Publications, consulting work, research. A 6854

Economics: Practical and theoretical, political philosophy slightly right of center, undergraduate top honors, business experience pre-dating W.W.II, past nine years own business, M.S., economics, Columbia, major finance (money and banking, organized markets, investment analysis and management). Man, 44, American born, Protestant, married. Would like teaching position in liberal arts college, eastern Penna., could double in an administrative capacity. Would consider other institutions, locations. Available fall, 1958. Reply direct to Box 242, Paoli, Penna.

Economics: Man, married. Ph.D., economics, Columbia. Now teaching at small liberal arts college; 8 years' teaching experience, 10 years in Federal government. Subjects: economic thought, international economics, government and business,

planning, labor, principles. Publications. Desire to transfer to another teaching post. A 6855

Economics and Business (Industrial and Personnel Management, Production, Economics, Labor, Marketing, Accounting, Business Administration): Man, 37, married. Ph.D. 3 years of college teaching; 10 years in business and industry. Interested in college or university teaching position. Available fall, 1958. A 6856

Education: See Science Education, Key No. A 6993.

Education: Woman, 40, single. Ed.D. Major: elementary education. Minors: general education and philosophy, also have completed 35 semester hours of mathematics. 19 consecutive years of rich and varied teaching experience, including classroom teaching in rural and urban schools, supervising student teachers; 4 years as general elementary supervisor of more than 175 elementary teachers; and the last 6 years as classroom and demonstration teacher in the training school of a leading state teachers college. Elected to and accepted membership in Kappa Delta Pi and Delta Kappa Gamma, life member of N.E.A., also member of A.A.U.P., N.C.T.M. and other organizations. [Withdrawn]

English: Husband and wife, 1 child. Man, 44. Ph.D., University of Illinois, 1955. 7 years' experience. Now director of freshman English in outstanding small liberal arts college. Specialty: English romantic movement and eighteenth century. Second specialty: sixteenth and seventeenth century English literature. Experienced in planning and teaching advanced courses. Significant article ready for publication. Others in process. Enthusiastic teacher. Top references. Wife, 24. M.A., Louisiana State University, 1955. Work beyond Master's at University of Illinois. Good references. Prefer part-time. Minimum combined yearly earning: $6000. Will consider position for husband only. A 6858

English: Man, 42, married. B.A. (highest honors), M.A., Ph.D. Phi Beta Kappa. 1 book and over 15 critical articles. Especially interested in literary criticism, novel, and 19th century American and English literature. Would like to teach on the graduate level, though not averse to undergraduate teaching. Willing to give up generous tenure status in order to locate in the Far West or East. Available September, 1958. A 6859

English: Man, 29, family. A.B., Concord College (W. Va.); M.A. expected in August, 1958, Marshall College, Huntington, W. Va. Taught freshman English as graduate assistant, Marshall College. Interested in teaching literature and composition. Recommendations available. Arthur James Mangus, Jr., 520 Seventeenth Street, Huntington, West Virginia.

French: Man, 38. Ph.D., Princeton. Particularly interested in elementary and intermediate courses, 18th and 19th century prose, and scientific reading courses. Author of 4 textbooks in use at major universities, 1 translation, bibliographical work. Many reviews. Desire teaching post in rank of associate professor; now assistant professor at large university. Available summer or fall, 1958. A 6860

French: Man, 39, Ph.D.; French mother tongue, now U. S. citizen. Experience teaching in top European and American universities. Field of specialization: phonetics, conversational training; theatre literature, theatre history, comparative literature (fluent in six languages, familiar with six literatures); well-known authority in language audio-visual aids and techniques, setting up laboratories; producer of audio-visual materials, recordings. Publications in these fields. Available summer, 1958. A 6861

French Language and Literature: Man. 18 years' experience teaching in European and Canadian universities. B.A., M.A., Ph.D. *cum laude*. Published pedagogical books and articles. University, college. A 6862

French and German: Woman, single; overseas qualifications with a major in English. 19 years' experience teaching; secondary, college and university students, also private—overseas and U.S.; excellent references; extensive foreign travel, residence; strong background, geography. Desire position in Southwest, South, Deep Southeast, or Florida. Available September, 1958. A 6863

French, History, Geography, Literature and Philosophy: Man with over 30 years' teaching experience. Professor at several colleges in France and the U.S., including Kenyon, Penn State Teachers, Catholic University (over 15 years), and Geo. Washington University. B.A., B.S., M.A., Ph.D. Catholic University. Officer of the Academy. Publications and lectures in several newspapers and

radio here and abroad. Desire position near Washington, D.C. or eastern to Middle-West U.S. Available immediately. A 6864

Geology: Ph.D., geology. Many years' experience teaching and private industry. Interested in faculty position, asso. prof. or better. Avail. Sept. Prefer Univ. Location immaterial. Married. A 6865

German: Man, 43, married. Ph.D., Hopkins. Native speaker. 8 years' experience; also experience in French, and excellent background in music and humanities. Some publication. Desire permanent position at institution with some research facilities, preferably West or North. A 6866

German, French, Comparative Literature: Woman, single, mature, Ph.D., 25 years' experience. Particular specialties: scientific German for graduate and undergraduate students, and preparation for advanced degree reading examinations. Listed in *Who's Who in the East, Directory of American Scholars, Who's Who in American Education.* Member Sigma Kappa Phi, Phi Kappa Phi. Publications. Innumerable committee memberships and chairmanships. Present rank: associate professor. Would like combination administrative and teaching position, preferably in a small college. Excellent references. Free to travel anywhere. A 6867

Hebrew Specialist, Bible and Rabbinics: M.A. (Oxon) *summa cum laude* for Hebrew, Aramaic and Syriac. Seek one-year probationary professorship; residence for self as part of salary might be acceptable. A 6868

History: Woman, 37, single. Ph.D. from leading university. Fields of specialization: European, Russian, and Far Eastern history. Publications. 6 years' teaching experience in history and social science. Will consider offer anywhere, including Hawaii, Alaska, and Canada. Excellently trained in Far Eastern international relations, Asian studies, and Chinese language and literature. Available summer or fall, 1958. A 6869

History: Man in late 30's. Ph.D. from major university. Well traveled, cultural interests and progressive outlook, book (2 more on the way) and fair amount of publications in American history. Now heading history and political science department in small Eastern liberal arts college. Seek relocation in high-grade university or college hospitable to research as well as good teaching. Credentials on request. Available summer or fall, 1958. A 6870

History: Man, 44, married. LL.B., Harvard; Ph.D., University of California. Phi Beta Kappa. 11 years' university teaching. Experience teaching speech and history. Fields: modern European history and English history. Want assignment in European history or humanities. Publications: book accepted, second book nearing completion, 4 articles and 2 syllabi published. Available fall, 1958, or spring, 1959. A 6871

History: Man, 39, single. A.B., A.M., Ph.D. and post-doctoral study. Major field: modern European history since 1789. Minors: early modern Europe and medieval history. Approximately 7 years' teaching experience; presently assistant professor at noted private university near Chicago. Available on semester's notice or less. Interested in a promising position to teach, do research, and continue writing. A 6872

History and/or Classics: Man, 41. Ph.D., Harvard. Greek, Roman, and Byzantine history, and classics. Also participated in civilization courses. Several years of teaching experience and research in leading universities. Published articles, reviews, and work. Now under contract for another publication with well-known publisher. Available in September, 1958. A 6873

History (Modern), Political Science, International Law: Doctor of Universal Jurisprudence. 54 years old, Christian, European background, American teaching experience. A 6874

Humanities: Man, married, no children. M.A., Ph.D. (Candidate), University of Chicago; other studies: Chicago Art Institute, The Sorbonne, De Paul University; Fellow, Committee on Social Thought, University of Chicago; Fellow, Nat'l Council on Religion in Higher Education; University of Chicago Fellow at the University of Paris; Board Member, Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies; *Catholic Who's Who;* contributor to all major Catholic publications; author, two books; third book, October, 1958; former editor, nat'l Catholic quarterly; American editorial consultant, Verlag Herder International. Available,

1959, to teach contemporary American, French, English literature; history of art; nineteenth century religious thought; Biblical literature; general program in humanities; minimum salary, $6000; minimum rank, assistant professor; in Catholic or non-Catholic liberal arts college. A 6875

International Affairs, Political Science: Man, Ph.D., Columbia. Have taught (grad, and undergrad.): international relations and organization, political theory, comparative and Am. Gov., international law, etc. Held responsible positions in government service and at U.N. and another internat. agency. Considerable research experience, incl. planning and supervision. Stimulating teacher. Lengthy bibliography. Widely travelled. Languages. Now teaching part-time at first-class Univ. Seek full-time position fall, 1958. A 6876

Librarian: Woman, 38, single. B.L.S., M.A. (English literature), Phi Beta Kappa. 15 years' well-rounded experience in liberal arts college libraries. Available fall, 1958. Northeast or Middle Atlantic area preferred. Résumé on request. A 6877

Librarianship: Man, 30, married. Candidate for Ph.D. in librarianship. Experience in library administration, reference, and teaching library science. Seeking responsible academic library position. Available Jan. 1, 1959. A 6878

Mathematics: Man, 48. M.A. Varied teaching experience. Civil Service Rating College Professor, GS-11. Excellent credentials. A 6979

Mathematics: Man, 46, American, married, 2 children. Ph.D. Professor, 16 years' college and university teaching experience, 7 years as department head, 5 years' applied mathematics in scientific development work. Strong in applied mathematics and mathematics education at the college level. Membership in professional organizations, officer in one, scholastic honors, publications. Prefer departmental chairmanship with institution interested in providing a balance between good teaching and research. Excellent references. Position, salary and availability open. A 6980

Mathematics: Man, 40, married, 3 children. Ph.D. 18 years of graduate and undergraduate teaching at a large university. Experience in directing advanced degrees, also some administrative duties. Publications. Interested in teaching and/or administrative work with a good liberal arts college or small university. Excellent references. A 6981

Mathematics, English Literature, Philosophy: M.A. of the University of Oxford, England. 22 years' successful experience in both undergraduate and graduate teaching in England and in U.S.A. Desire appointments for summer 1959, and academic year 1959–60. Excellent references. A 6982

Medical Sciences (Fundamental Biology): Woman, retirement age, Ph.D., Sc.D. 20 years of teaching-professional experiences. Present, research work, reviewing and coordinating biological-chemical-physical sciences; and to religion. Capable in instruction biological sciences, as biological consultant; or as associate in biological research. A 6983

Modern Languages: Man, 49, married, 1 child. M.A., LL.M., of European universities. Long teaching experience; fluency in numerous languages. Desire position at college, university or similar institution to teach German and/or Russian. Also proficient in Latin. Available in summer or autumn, 1958. A 6984

Philosophy: Man, 30, single. Ph.D., University of Ottawa, Canada; 10 years' teaching experience. Active in debating groups. Present rank, associate professor. Specialty: scholastic philosophy; also, modern philosophy. Membership in A.A.U.P., American Catholic Philosophical Association; listed in *Who's Who in American Education*. Have handled Latin and Greek. Will also consider administrative position. A 6985

Philosophy and/or Religion: Man, 32, married. A.B., William and Mary (Phi Beta Kappa); B.D. and Ph.D., Yale. Fulbright scholar at Heidelberg University. 5 years' teaching experience. Several articles and reviews published, book in preparation. References testify to ability and enthusiasm as teacher. Able to offer usual undergraduate courses in philosophy and religion. Special interests: contemporary philosophy and religion, Bible, history of Christian thought. Available September, 1958. A 6986

Physics: Man, 57, Ph.D. 34 years' experience teaching physics; 11 years as associate and full professor in large Midwestern college. Taught general, upper-

.nvision and graduate courses, including quantum mechanics and statistical mechanics. Salary: $7728–8000 and over. A 6987

Physics: Man, 43; desire research position or teaching post in university. A 6988

Political Science: Man, married, 3 children. B.A., M.A., LL.B., Ph.D. in international relations. 7 years' teaching experience, plus business and legal. Fields: international politics, international organization, international law, American and comparative government, civil liberties. Veteran. Widely travelled. Available September, 1958. A 6989

Political Science, International Affairs: See International Affairs, Political Science, Key No. A 6876.

Russian: Man (an Ukrainian by origin), 50, B.Ed., M.Sc., Ph.D. 18 years' experience in teaching, 12 years at colleges and universities (3 years in the U.S.). Available June or September, 1958. A 6991

Russian (Scientific and Medical): Man (Russian, naturalized), Ph.D. in physiological sciences, unusual linguistic, writing, and teaching talents. Extensive experience in translating and editing scientific Russian into precise, idiomatic English. Developed simple and rapid system for teaching scientific Russian; text in preparation for publication. Solid background in current Russian physiologic research and in the history and philosophy of Russian medical thought. Interested in opportunity to develop creative teaching and research programs. A 6992

Science Education: Man, 52, married. A.B., B.S., M.A., M.Ed., expect to receive Ed.D. in August, 1958; 160 semester hours in science and education. 13 years of experience in public schools as teacher and administrator, and 12 years of college teaching in elementary and secondary science education in state supported schools. Member of Phi Delta Kappa, American Men of Science, etc. Listed in *Who's Who in Education*. Presently teaching in a state institution. Available September, 1958. A 6993

Sociology, Anthropology, History: Man, 36, single, World War 2 veteran. B.A., M.A., University of North Carolina; course work completed on Doctor's degree at Syracuse University, dissertation in process. 4½ years of teaching experience in undergraduate schools of Southern universities. Courses taught include courses in sociology and cultural anthropology. 2 years' social work experience. Present rank: assistant professor of sociology. Member American Sociological Society. Desire position in undergraduate department; will consider junior college. Can go anywhere in the United States. Available June or September. A 6994

Sociology, Social Psychology, Criminology, Social Work: Man, 32, married, 2 children. Near Ph.D. 4½ years' teaching (college and institution staffs), 1½ years' supervision of field work, 7 years' correctional and institutional work; 2 articles. A 6995

Spanish: Woman, 36, single. U.S. born. B.A., M.A., Doctor Romanic philology from University of Madrid. 12 years' college teaching experience, assistant professor. Publications: 5 books and many articles. Desire position with permanent possibilities, and good chance of promotion. A 6996

Late Addenda

Administration: Man, 36, 5 children. Ph.D., history; 5 yrs. administrative officer (Dir. of Libs.) following 5 years teaching, including graduate instruction and thesis direction, some ed. TV. Familiar with budget, personnel, committee work. Distinguished record public and community service, public speaking, public relations, some fund raising; organized lecture series and state conferences on public affairs. Excellent references. Available September, 1958 for challenging administrative post with or without teaching. A 6997

Botany, Plant Physiology: Man, 31, married, 1 child. B.S., Lebanon Valley College; M.S., Rutgers University. Desire academic appointment with opportunity to teach and do some research. Interests in growth and reproduction, ecological physiology, general botany, and biology. 2 years' teaching experience, 5 years' research experience. Presently a research assistant in plant physiology department completing program for doctorate. Position and salary open. Location in Northeast preferred. Available September, 1958. A 6998

Business Administration and Business Education: Summer or possibly fall position desired by assistant professor in large university. Subjects include: general business courses, accounting, management. Hold M.B.A. A 6999

Classical Languages: Man, Ph.D., Chicago; 10 years' college experience; additional experience in high school and industrial teaching. Desire assistant or associate professorship. Proficient in Latin and Greek languages and literature; also classical life and civilization, mythology, classical influence on English literature. Especially interested in classical rhetoric and political philosophy. A 7000

Economics: Man, 35, single. M.A., '53. 3 years' teaching economics and marketing. 10 years business and government experience. Bilingual: French—English. Available now. A 7001

Economics and Business (Industrial and Personnel Management, Labor Economics, Money and Banking, Principles of Economics, Intermediate Economic Theory, and Statistics): Man, 43, married, 2 children. A.B., M.A., requirements for Ph.D. completed except dissertation, which is in progress. 10 years of successful college and university teaching in above fields. 9 years of personnel experience in industry and government. Especially interested in college or university teaching position. Prefer Midwest location. Available fall, 1958. A 7002

Education: Man, 33, married, 2 children, Ed.D. Fields: secondary education, methods (especially social science), curriculum, the philosophical, social, and psychological foundations of education, and adolescent psychology. Experience: public school teaching, and government administration. Publications. Considerable travel experience. Desire college or university teaching, preferably in western U. S. Available September, 1958. A 7003

English: Man, 31, married, 2 children. Ph.D., A.B. *magna cum laude*, now compatibly employed on a "temporary" basis by a major Southern university. Desire a regular assistant professorship. Nine years' college teaching experience at all levels of undergraduate work, with some graduate teaching. Specialty: 19th C English literature. Available September, 1958. A 7004

English and/or Journalism: Woman, 33, married. M.S. in journalism. Completed all but thesis for Ph.D. Have taught journalism, English composition, English literature. Publications adviser on college newspaper and yearbook. Wide background and experience on newspapers and publishing. Have received scholarships, research appointments, and am member of several professional societies. Prefer Long Island or New York location. Available summer or fall, 1958. A 7005

Geology (Marine), Geophysics, Oceanography: Man, internationally established research geophysicist and consulting geologist; desire association with research organization or university active in oceanography, marine geology, geophysics. Patents and publications in these fields; 3 years' teaching college geology. A 7006

History: See Administration, Key No. A 6997.

History and/or Political Science: Man, 28, married, 2 children. Master of Social Science in history and political science; advanced graduate study. 3 years' teaching experience. A 7007

Library Administration: See Administration, Key No. A 6997.

Speech, Public Address; Administration (Public School, Junior College, College): Man, mid-forties, married. B.S. in Educ. (approx. 60 hours in educ., including administration); M.A. (speech); Ph.D. (general speech, general address, psychology of communication). Experienced in general speech, forensics and debate (high school and college), administration (speech and other). Now professor with tenure, department chairman (speech and drama), good institution. Prefer clement, sunny climate (South, Southwest, West) but would consider other. Wife also available; M.A. (Columbia); experienced. A 7008

Vacancy in Chemistry: Medium-sized state college, Southwest: opening in analytical and/or physical chemistry, September. Modern department; small town near city. Ph.D. preferred but M.S. considered. Qualifications determine salary, rank. V 1429

AAUP BULLETIN

A publication of the

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Summer Issue

VOLUME 44 NUMBER 2 JUNE 1958

Index to Advertisers

Lawson Associates, Inc.	Cover Two
McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc.	Cover Three
International Business Machines Corporation	Cover Four
American Council on Education	ii
The American Humanist Association	iii
Association of American Colleges	iii
The Advancement and Placement Institute	iv
Wicks & Riegler Company	iv
American Association of Junior Colleges	iv
Clark-Brewer Teachers Agency	v
Private School & College Bureau	v
American Association of University Professors	v
The Baltimore Teachers Agency	vi
Rinehart & Co. Inc.	vi
The Associated Teachers' Agency	vi
The Bryant Teachers Bureau, Inc.	vi
Educational Placements	vi
Abrahams Magazine Service	vi
Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association	vii

A GUIDE TO GRADUATE STUDY:

PROGRAMS LEADING TO THE PH.D. DEGREE

Edited by Frederic W. Ness

The first complete description of the programs and fields of study offered by 135 graduate schools. Information for the undergraduate and his adviser on preparation, selection, admission and financing graduate study.

Published by Association of American Colleges

Sold by American Council on Education

335 pages, Cloth $5.00

AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

7th Edition, 1956, $12.00

AMERICAN JUNIOR COLLEGES

4th Edition, 1956, $8.00

The only descriptive directories of accredited higher institutions in the United States are indispensable references for those concerned with higher education.

The Educational Record

A quarterly journal discussing administrative and curricular problems. $3.00 a year

Higher Education and National Affairs

A bulletin reporting and interpreting significant national issues and congressional activities. $2.00 per year

Send Orders to Dept. P

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.,
Washington 6, D. C.

THE HUMANIST ADVANCE COMMITTEE

Hermann J. Muller, *Chairman*
G. Brock Chisholm, *Vice Chairman*
and including—

Frederick Burkhardt	A. H. Maslow
Witter Bynner	Herbert J. Muller
Stuart C. Dodd	Max C. Otto
Erich Fromm	Sidney Ratner
S. I. Hayakawa	Priscilla Robertson
Julian Huxley	Bertrand Russell
Horace M. Kallen	B. F. Skinner
William H. Kilpatrick	Harold Taylor

—invites you to subscribe to THE HUMANIST at a special trial rate: 3 issues for $1.00. (Regularly $3.00 a year, 6 issues.)

THE AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION, Dept. U
Post Office Box 227, Yellow Springs, Ohio

Outstanding LIBERAL EDUCATION Publications

Association of American Colleges BULLETIN issued four times a year $4.00

American Education and World Responsibility—Proceedings of the 44th Annual Meeting—Annual Reports, Minutes, Membership, Constitution—March 1958 BULLETIN $1.50

A Guide to Graduate Study edited by Frederic W. Ness cloth $5.00

Directory of Fellowships in the Arts and Sciences edited by L. Virginia Bosch $2.50

Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges

Comprehensive Examinations in the Humanities by Edward Safford Jones each $ .50

Association of American Colleges
726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

INDEXING

- technical and non-technical
- arts and sciences
- physics, medicine, law, engineering or any other classification.

Your own efficient and economical system prepared by specialists.

Write for information

Wicks & Riegler Company

Three Mile Hill Road, Middlebury, Connecticut

Increase Your Income Now

NON-FEE PLACEMENT

CRUSADE, the approved monthly **NON-FEE** Placement Journal, contains a wealth of interesting openings which show you how easy it is to increase your income now. Each month (even during summer months) you will receive authentic and complete job data, plus salaries about actual U.S. and fascinating World opportunities at all levels and subjects.
(Teaching, Library, College and Administrative positions—Summer Jobs—Graduate Awards—Student Aid). **NO FEES—APPLY DIRECT.** Members' qualifications, school and library vacancies listed **FREE.** Highly recommended by 1000's of successful educators since '52.

☐ **2 issues $2.00** ☐ **12 issues (yrly) $5.00**
☐ **Send 25¢ for SAMPLE RESUME**

POSITION-OF-THE MONTH IN SPAIN

OPPORTUNITIES for Sept. 1958. Teachers, and Inspector-Supervisor of English with knowledge of Spanish for Spain's leading language center. Teaching experience essential. Age to 50. Limited number of openings. Be first to apply. Complete details and application procedure for these positions and 1000's of other non-fee Foreign and U. S. positions appear in the May issue and every issue of **CRUSADE.**

WORLD-WIDE GRADUATE AWARD DIRECTORY

First compilation of Graduate Awards ever prepared for teachers and librarians to subsidize the continuation of their education in over 320 Universities, 42 States, and 31 Foreign Countries. (Stipends, $200-$10,000.) Choose the location and study you prefer, informs you of the amount, conditions, how, and to whom, you apply.

☐ **$2.00 GRADUATE AWARD DIRECTORY**

CRUSADE, Dept. UPB

Box 99, Greenpt. Sta., B'klyn 22, N. Y.

☐ **Postcard brings exciting details FREE**
☐ **Send this announcement with any order of $2.00 or more and receive 5 FREE RESUME FORMS OFFER EXPIRES JUNE 30, 1958**

Subscribe to—

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL

Because:

—America today should be well informed about the fastest growing phase of education.

—It is the only national periodical devoted to the junior-college movement.

—It is edited by one of America's most distinguished educators, JAMES W. REYNOLDS of the University of Texas.

—The live, forward-looking program of research and service is published in the JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL.

Subscription price, $4.00 a year

1785 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

PRIVATE SCHOOL

&

COLLEGE BUREAU

...professional guidance

selective placement...

30 East 39th Street

New York 16, N.Y.

Gabriel James–Dir.

N.A.T.A.

CLARK-BREWER TEACHERS AGENCY

(77th year)

Increasing College and University enrollments are making more acute the problem of securing well-qualified instructional personnel.

ADMINISTRATORS as well as COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS value our Nation-wide Service.

C. J. COOIL, MGR.
505 Columbia Bldg.
Spokane 4, Washington

(Member National Association of Teachers' Agencies)

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

The only organization in higher education that—

- Consistently examines the whole area of higher education from the faculty point of view.
- Tries to find common ground with administrators and trustees for the establishment and observance of professional principles.
- Deals habitually with specific cases of difficulty or conflict in terms of established principles.
- Constantly, through its *Bulletin,* sets forth, for the use of teachers, administrative officers, trustees, and the interested public, a consistent philosophy of the faculty's role in institutions of higher education, the faculty's responsibilities in that role, and the conditions of service essential to the faculty's performance.

The Association Needs and Deserves Your Support

BRYANT TEACHERS BUREAU

1025 Witherspoon Bldg.
Philadelphia 7, Pa.
Pennypacker 5-1223

Member National Association Teachers Agencies

Faculty Placement Service
for
Colleges—Universities
and
Seeondary—Elementary

THE BALTIMORE TEACHERS AGENCY

(Established in 1925)

We offer a reliable, nation-wide school and college placement service under the direction of a staff of experienced school and college teachers. If you are a teacher seeking a position, or an executive seeking a teacher, write, or telephone MUlberry 5-6850.

WILLIAM K. YOCUM, Mgr.
516 N. Charles St.
Baltimore 1, Md.

Member National Association of Teachers Agencies

EDUCATIONAL PLACEMENTS

ELISABETH KING, DIR.

Placing teachers and administrators in schools and colleges, in all subject fields.

Music Division:
Music Teachers Placement Service

516 Fifth Avenue
New York 36, N. Y.

Member National Association of Teachers Agencies

RINEHART

College Publishers

of texts and reference works in over 20 academic areas, noted for their foward-looking content, scholarly editing, and award-winning design.

Send for ovr new 1958 catalogue

Rinehart & Company, Inc.
232 Madison Ave., New York 16, N. Y.

PERIODICALS WANTED

Educational—Scholarly
Medical & Scientific Journals

High prices paid for your accumulations of periodicals — SETS — RUNS and VOLUMES in All fields—All languages

Send us your list of journals for sale and our best offer will follow promptly.

ABRAHAMS MAGAZINE SERVICE
56 E. 13th St., Dept. A New York 3 N. Y.

"Suppliers of BACK ISSUES since 1889"

THE ASSOCIATED TEACHERS' AGENCY

522 Fifth Ave., New York 36, N. Y.

(Established 1924)

Our PERSONALIZED SERVICE PLAN assures discerning and prompt attention to the requests from schools and colleges. The range of this service is from the university to the kindergarten level, for public and private schools, colleges, and universities, for any branch of instruction or administration.

Mrs. Louise Tatro
Director
Member National Association of Teachers' Agencies

Medical Expenses mount up fast

Now, through TIAA's new MAJOR MEDICAL EXPENSE INSURANCE, colleges can help free their staff members from concern over the financial problems of medical care for themselves and their families.

TIAA MAJOR MEDICAL is issued on the Group basis and can be added to a "base plan" such as Blue Cross-Blue Shield or designed to provide the entire medical expense insurance program at the college.

Colleges, universities, independent schools, and certain foundations and other nonprofit educational or research institutions are eligible whether or not they now have a TIAA retirement or insurance program.

To learn more about this important protection, complete and return:

Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association
522 Fifth Avenue, New York 36, New York

Please send information on MAJOR MEDICAL EXPENSE INSURANCE *to:*

Name_____

Title_____

Employing Institution_____

Address_____

C

THE ASSOCIATION

IS ITS MEMBERSHIP

A greater Association will require—

- **A larger membership.**

  From 13,377 in 1937 to 37,363 in 1958 is a gratifying increase, but a greater potential remains untouched. The Central Office will assist to the utmost all efforts by chapters to increase their membership.

- **A better informed membership.**

  A larger Association must not be allowed to become a stumbling giant, but must be aware of the important issues confronting higher education, and must be prepared to discuss them from the distinctive viewpoint of the academic profession.

- **A more responsible membership.**

  The Association must strongly counter the jibe that its members demand rights and powers, but are slow to accept the concomitant responsibility. Through its officers and committees, the Association exercises responsible leadership in matters of professional concern, and encourages a corresponding assumption of responsibility by its chapters and its individual members.

- **A more courageous membership.**

  A strong basis of professional courage would be found in a larger Association membership, understanding and accepting its professional responsibilities, and prepared to take its rightful place of leadership in meeting those needs of society which higher education alone can meet.

The American Association of University

Professors needs and deserves your support

OUTSTANDING McGRAW-HILL BOOKS

AN INTRODUCTION TO SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

By **E. BRIGHT WILSON, JR.**, Professor of Chemistry, Harvard University, 375 pages, 51 illustrations, $6.00

Collects and explains a number of general principles, techniques, and guides for research procedure. The discussion ranges from the choice of a research project, through design of experiments, to analyzing data and reporting results.

ADULT EDUCATION

By **HOMER KEMPFER**, National Home Study Council. *McGraw-Hill Series in Education.* 446 pages, $5.50

Treats systematically the practical problems of adult education . . . emphasizing its changing nature, its potential impact on the total educational pattern, and pointing the way to an integrated "community program of adult education." It also relates adult education to our accelerating science and technology.

A FOURTH OF A NATION

By **PAUL WOODRING.** 264 pages, $4.50

This unique and challenging work goes to the heart of the problem in the need for a new educational philosophy—one which would make accommodation for the exceptional student by grading groups within high schools according to ability. The author believes that this system will produce the truly educated person.

THE STORY OF EDUCATION: Philosophical and Historical Foundations

By **I. N. THUT**, University of Connecticut. 408 pages, $5.95

Provides an historical and comparative approach to the philosophy of education. All important philosophical theories concerning the ways in which knowledge is received, discovered, and constructed are discussed. It deals with the origins and evolution of the theory and practice of education in the Western World.

THE CHALLENGE OF SOVIET EDUCATION

By **GEORGE S. COUNTS.** 340 pages, $6.00

Here, for the first time, is a book which reveals the magnitude of Soviet education and its attempts to control the mind of an entire society. It is a hard look at the unparalleled growth and scope of the Russian Educational machinery, with a challenge no American can safely ignore.

• • • SEND FOR COPIES ON APPROVAL • • •

McGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY, INC.

330 West 42nd Street **New York 36, N. Y.**

Opportunities for management development at IBM

Perhaps your students may ask what IBM offers in the way of a Management Development Program. Here's the answer:

Employees who show by their performance outstanding initiative and a capacity for leadership are invited to participate in the IBM Management Development Program. Through it they acquire the philosophies, principles and skills needed for effective business management.

The program is designed to meet the needs of the various plants, labs and divisions. Representative courses such as Principles of Management, Human Relations, and Conference Leadership supplement IBM's technical training program, thereby augmenting capabilities essential for management.

This is another example of the IBM concept that to develop the business you must develop the man.

If you would like informational booklets for your students about Management Development at IBM, just write to:

Director of Recruitment, IBM Corp., Dept. 504R
590 Madison Avenue, New York 22, New York

IBM INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION